CORRESPONDENCE ON FIELD AND GLEYSTEEN CASE.

Rev. Frank E. Field - Dover, Ill. - Nov. 24th., 1904.

Rev. Wm. H. Gleysteen - Alton, Iowa. - Aug. 6, 1904.

" " " " " " - Sept. 12, 1904.

" " " " " " - Sept. 22, 1904.

" " " " " " - Sept. 30, 1904.

" " " " " " - Oct. 11, 1904.

" " " " " " - Oct. 18, 1904.

" " " " " " - Oct. 28, 1904.

" " " " " " - Nov. 1, 1904.

" " " " " " - Nov. 15, 1904.

" " " " " " - Nov. 18, 1904.

" " " " " " - Nov. 28, 1904.

Dr. Frederick Campbell - Brooklyn, N.Y. - July 25, 1904.

" " " - " " - Oct. 12, 1904.

Resolution of Presbytery - Campbell - - = Oct. 25, 1904.

" " " - " " - Nov. 4, 1904.

" " " - " " - Dec. 1, 1904.

Rev. Wm. J. Hutchins, Brooklyn, N.Y. - Oct. 4, 1904.

" " " " " " - Oct. 17, 1904.

" " " " " " - Oct. 21, 1904.

Dr. R. R. Booth - Long Beach, N.Y. - July 29, 1904.

Dr. George Alexander - 47 University Place - N.Y. - July 28, 1904/

Samuel W. Wilson - Wansan, Wis. - Nov. 22., 1904.

Rev. John Fox - Bible House - N.Y. - Oct. 15, 1904.

Dr. N. W. Wells - Cooperstown, N.Y. - August 19, 1904.

Dr. W. R. Richards Dec. 22, 1904

NOTES ON THE CASE OF GLEYSTEEN AND FIELD.

1st. With the questions of alleged irregularity in the proceedings of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, we are not concerned, as those questions do not affect the validity of the ordination of Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen, and as they concern only the Presbytery of Brooklyn in its relation to the higher judicatories of the Church. Whether the Presbytery should have set aside certain rules or not, the fact is it did in its discretion set them aside, and the Synod while taking exception to the method did not rescind the act. These questions should therefore be eliminated from our consideration of the missionary aspects of the case.

doct not consid — marriage — not before

2nd. The statement that the Board December 5th finally approved the sailing of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen by a vote of six to four, while accurate as a matter of record, creates a wrong impression as to the real judgment of the Board. One member of the Board who was present did not vote because he was in the Chair, but he has stated that if he had not been in the Chair, he would have voted with the majority. Another member who was present did not vote because of his personal relation to the case, but he had at a previous meeting voted to approve the sailing of these men and he later accepted ~~the~~ appointment on a Committee to prepare an answer to the protest now under consideration. Moreover one of the four men who voted with the minority afterward declined to sign the protest on the ground that there were some elements in the situation of which he had not been informed on account of his absence from previous meetings of the Board. Six members of the Board were absent. So far as known, not one of them would have voted with the minority, but three of them to our ~~personal~~ positive knowledge would have voted with the majority if they had been present. Out of a Board of twenty members, Dr. Paxton having died, the minority of four represents so far as we know the total objection in the Board to the sailing of these men, and of the four only three

have put their objection in the form of a protest. Of course these considerations are not vital to a decision of the question which is now before the Committee, but they should perhaps be made to correct any possible misapprehension as to the real attitude of the Board.

3rd. I thoroughly respect and sympathize with the motive of the protestants in desiring that only men of sound evangelical views should be sent to the foreign field. I am sure that the Committee will believe me when I state that not one member or officer of the Board favors sending to the field any man who is ~~not~~ unsound in the faith. The standing in the church of the members and officers of that Board should be a sufficient guarantee of this. Altogether they form as soundly an evangelical Board of men as it would be possible to gather from the Presbyterian Church. The question, therefore, is not at all as to the disposition of the Board to send unsound men to the field.

4th. There is no adequate evidence in our judgment that Messrs. Field and Gleysteen are unsound in their Theological views. It should be borne in mind that not one of the protestants ever saw Messrs. Gleysteen and Field, ever heard a word from their lips or so far as I know ever saw a line from their pens. The protestants are wholly dependent upon the statements of a small minority of the Presbytery of Brooklyn. But the members of that minority stated their objection on the floor of the Presbytery at the time when Messrs. Field and Gleysteen were up for examination. The other members of the Presbytery differed with the minority as to the soundness of the views of the candidates under consideration . But to make sure that no mistake was being made and in deference to the fears of the minority, the two young men were called back at a subsequent meeting of the Presbytery and were carefully examined we are told for a solid hour in Theology alone, after which the

Refusal investig did - ref back action Presby

Presbytery by a three-fourths majority emphatically sustained their examination and ordained them. Now the simple question is, shall we accept as decisive the statements of a small minority whose views were thoroughly made known to the Presbytery and were over-ruled by that body, or shall we accept as decisive the thrice repeated and decisive opinion of three-fourths of the members of the Presbytery that these men are sound? I appreciate the difficulties especially as I have a warm personal friendship for some of the members of the minority, but I have also a warm personal friendship for and all confidence in many of the members of the majority and I feel that in a matter of this sort, I should so far as my own personal judgment is concerned, accept the judgment of twenty-six men rather than the judgment of three or four.

It will be noted that the protestants in their formal paper hinged their whole opinion xx as to the unsoundness of these candidates upon the statement of an "honored member of our Board." The member referred to is the Honorable Darwin R. James, but Mr. James as a member of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, voted to license and ordain Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen. October 17th he voted in the Board of Foreign Missions to authorize them to sail to the field. December 19th he accepted membership on a Committee of the Board to answer the protest filed by Dr. Booth, and Dr. Fox and Mr. Van Norden, and his name is signed to the answer to that protest which will be found upon the records of the Board. These facts should certainly be decisive as to the position of Mr. James and should serve to quash any argument based upon his opinion that the men in question are unsound.

It is true that the minority of the Presbytery in withdrawing their complaint to Synod did so in a written statement which appeared to imply that in their judgment the Presbytery had ordained men who are unsound, but the statement does not affirm that the Presbytery had done

so. The supposition that the Presbytery had thus acted is a ~~poor~~ mere inference and surely ~~truly~~ a man cannot be tried on an inference. If the complainants actually believed that Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen were not sound upon the doctrine of the Atonement, it was their duty to say so in a positive form and since they did not put their statement in positive form, that statement should be eliminated. We may have our opinion as to the wisdom and fairness of the complainants making such an indirect and inconclusive statement, but surely we cannot condemn the men to whom reference is made on such a purely negative inference. Moreover it should be borne in mind that the ~~testimony of the Corresponding~~ Chairman of the Committee which waited upon the complainants and secured their withdrawal of the complaint, testifies that he received it at the time with the express understanding that the Committee did not for a moment conceive that the Presbytery had ordained men who were unsound and that the Presbytery would take the same position.

In view of all these circumstances, the assumption that Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen are doctrinely unsound must rest either upon the supposition that the three-fourths majority of the Presbytery of Brooklyn does not know what sound theological views in the Presbyterian Church are, or that, knowing such views, the Presbytery is deliberately unfaithful to them. I submit that neither assumption can be entertained for a moment.

5th. The real question at issue is not the soundness or unsoundness of these men, but whether the Boards of the Church or the Presbyteries of the Church are to be the judges of the orthodoxy of ministers. We hold that a Board is not an ecclesiastical body and that it has no ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It is primarily a permanent Committee of the General Assembly vested with large powers and wide discretion for the purposes ~~of~~ for which it is constituted, and for those purposes only. But those powers and that discretion

are strictly limited by the authority given to it by the Assembly. A board has no power to act authoritatively within the jurisdiction of a judicatory of the Church.

Now the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church places in the presbyteries all questions affecting the doctrinal standing of its ministers. It is one of the glories of our Church and one of the safe-guards of sound evangelical religion and of the liberty of the individual minister that a minister is responsible to his Presbytery alone for his doctrinal views, and that if he is in good standing in his presbytery that standing must be accepted by all the agencies of the Church. It is true that a presbytery may occasionally exercise its power hastily or unwisely. There is not a scintilla of evidence that the Presbytery of Brooklyn did so, but even though some Presbytery should occasionally be careless, I believe that the interests of Presbyterianism and of evangelical religion will in the long run be more fully supported by upholding the authority and the dignity of the judicatories of the Church within their proper ~~scale~~ sphere than by ~~bringing down~~ lessening that authority and dignity by the attempt to transfer their powers to other bodies which act without the constitutional safe-guards which surround the presbytery. It will readily be seen what confusion and injustice would result if the Board of Foreign Missions were to constitute itself a Court of Review and control of the Presbyteries. Is it for us as a Board to decide ~~what~~ which members of ~~the~~ a Presbytery are orthodox and which are not? The Boards have sometimes been accused of taking too much ~~upon~~ power in the Presbyterian Church, but here is a case where ~~the~~ a board protests against being given a power which it ~~certainly~~ sincerely believes would be unwise and injurious to the best interests of the cause.

The Board has indeed a heavy responsibility for the missionaries under its care, and the Board is under solemn obligations to the

General Assembly and to the whole Church to see that only men approved in the faith are sent to the field. But we believe that the method by which the Board shall satisfy itself that men are approved in the faith is not by forming itself into a theological court and over-riding the judgments of presbyteries, but it is by referring questions affecting the theological views of candidates to the presbyteries to which the candidates belong, which is precisely what the Board did in this instance. If the Board has reason to believe that a given candidate may have some views which would unfit him for service on the foreign field, and which perhaps not fully brought out in his original examination, the Board should, as it did in this instance, refer the matter a second time to the Presbytery for full inquiry, but when the Presbytery reports its decision, that decision should be accepted by the Board.

A parallel case which I have in mind occurred in connection with the recent suit before the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in order to determine whether the La Follette or Stalwart factions of the Republican Party had the right to print the names of their candidates on the regular Republican Ticket for the elections of 1904. The Supreme Court found that the law of Wisconsin vested the right to determine such questions in the State Committee of the party concerned, and that that Committee had decided in favor of the La Follette faction. The Supreme Court therefore promptly decided in favor of the La Follette faction ticket. In its decision, which was handed down October 5th, 1904, the Supreme Court states:

"The foregoing conclusion follows logically and necessarily from the legal aspects of the case before stated. What the real right of the matter in dispute might be found to be, were this court permitted to disregard the decision of the special tribunal, and investigate and determine the merits of the controversy from that standpoint, it has no right to decide or suggest. Duly constituted authority having spoken within its jurisdiction, it must be conclusively presumed here to have spoken rightly."

In my judgment that is precisely the situation ~~here.~~ in the matter before us. The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church places in the presbytery the right

to determine the doctrinal soundness of a minister. The Presbytery of Brooklyn acted within its constitutional rights in determining that question in the cases of Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen. The Board of Foreign Missions is therefore obliged so far as that question is concerned to accept the finding of the Presbytery. In the language of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin "duly constituted authority having spoken within its jurisdiction, it must be conclusively presumed" by the Board to have spoken correctly. Patterson - Bowie not submit

These are the main considerations as they appear to us. We shall be very glad to have the General Assembly pass upon them, bearing in mind that the real question is not so much the orthodoxy of given men as to the methods which shall be adopted by your Board of Foreign Missions in determining that orthodoxy. In our judgment the rights of the presbyteries to act within their constitutional powers and the liberty of Presbyterian ministers to be amenable solely to their presbyteries in all matters of doctrinal opinion are the essential ~~arguments~~ points that are involved in this question.

New York City, Ovt. 5, 1904.

The undersigned, members of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, whose names were attached to the complaint of July 16th, last, addressed to the Synod of New York, having received from the appointed committee of Presbytery a copy of the resolution of Presbytery, requesting the withdrawal of the complaint, do hereby express their compliance with said request, by authorizing the complaint to be withdrawn.

In so doing, the undersigned desire it to be distinctly understood that the step which they now take is not due to any change of conviction as to the things complained of or the grounds on which complaint was made. But, it being manifest by expressions of members in Presbytery that the object of the complaint is already largely accomplished, we entertain hope that in the future a strict adherence to Presbyterian doctrine and law will obviate the necessity of repeating the step which we have taken solely as a matter of principle and with very deep pain; and we accept the assurances given us by Presbytery that irregularities such as are complained of will not be repeated. We further state that our withdrawal of the complaint is (only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards.)

Lewis Ray Foote,
Frederick Campbell,
Walter M. Aikman ,
Darwin R. James,
Eliphalet B. Terry.

Please return

Council
Dr Alexander

RECEIVED
JUL 27 1904
Dr. Brown.

THE JACKSON HEALTH RESORT,
DANSVILLE, NEW YORK.

JAMES H. JACKSON, M.D. PRESIDENT.
WALTER E. GREGORY, M.D. JAMES ARTHUR JACKSON, M.D. SECY & MGR.
HELEN D. GREGORY, TREAS. KATE J. JACKSON, M.D.

July 25, 1904.

Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.:
Dear Dr. Brown: J. Campbell.

Dr. Newell Woolsey Wells has turned over to me the correspondence from Dr. Haley relative to the cases of Messrs. Field and Gleystein, as I am Dr. Wells' successor in the office of Stated Clerk of Brooklyn Presbytery.

It is impossible for me to sign the blank certificates enclosed by him, for the reason that Presbytery has not recommended the young men to the Foreign Board. That question did not come up.

THE JACKSON HEALTH RESORT,
DANSVILLE, NEW YORK.

JAMES H. JACKSON, M.D. PRESIDENT.
WALTER E. GREGORY, M.D. JAMES ARTHUR JACKSON, M.D. SECY & MGR.
HELEN D. GREGORY, TREAS. KATE J. JACKSON, M.D.

Presbytery did sustain the examination of the young man for license, first by a vote of 6 to 6, the Moderator thus voting with the affirmative, and again, on reconsideration, by a vote of 22 to 8, at a subsequent special meeting.

At the first meeting the massary $\frac{3}{4}$ could not be found to make theirs an "extraordinary case", hence they were not licensed. At the second meeting the $\frac{3}{4}$ also failed for want of one vote, which however was thereupon secured by re-taking the vote

(3)

THE JACKSON HEALTH RESORT,
DANSVILLE, NEW YORK.

JAMES H. JACKSON, M.D. PRESIDENT.
WALTER E. GREGORY, M.D. JAMES ARTHUR JACKSON, M.D. SECY & MGR.
HELEN D. GREGORY, TREAS. KATE J. JACKSON, M.D.

by ballot, the Moderator being thus enabled to vote.

The young man were thereupon immediately licensed and ordained.

Complaint against the action of Presbytery has been made to Synod and will be presented by the Stated Clerk of that body in October.

Very truly yours,

Frederick Campbell,
Stated Clerk.

F. Campbell.

2

Brooklyn, December 2, 1904.

Dear Dr. Brown:

Your letter came this morning. I am surprised to find that I failed to mail you the letter which I now enclose, last night, for it was prepared, enclosed and addressed, and here I find it still lying on my desk this morning. The temporary clerk did not get me the minutes and documents promptly, and there was slight delay even when they came before my letter was written. If I had not overlooked the mailing of my letter last night it would be in your hands first delivery this morning. I knew however that your meeting did not occur till next Monday and did not suppose the slight delay was at all serious. I beg you to pardon it.

Yours sincerely,

Copy. *Telegram.* Oct. 17th, 1904.

The Rev. W. H. Gleysteen,
Alton, Iowa.

Sailing delayed. Board deferred matter until after Synod meeting.

(signed) Robert E. Speer.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2.

Copy.

December 23rd, 1904.

The Rev. William R. Richards, D. D.,
14 East 37th Street, New York City.

My dear Dr. Richards:-

I regret that absence from the city on account of the illness of my son prevented my seeing you when you called. I now hasten to submit the following replies to your letter of the 22nd inst. The Board's direction to the Secretaries to correspond with Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen regarding their doctrinal views was given October 17th, and was as follows:

"It was voted to delay the sailing of Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field and to defer further action in their case until after the meeting of the Synod of New York; and the Secretaries were instructed to correspond with the young men with a view to conference with them on the part of the Board as to their doctrinal views."

Mr. Speer has drawn up ten reasons, which I enclose herewith (enclosure #1), why the Executive Council did not carry out this instruction immediately.

At the next meeting of the Board November 7th, the Board virtually approved the action of the Council by directing them to refrain from corresponding with the young men (enclosure #2). I think it worth noting that this direction to the Council to refrain from corresponding with these men was taken on the motion of Dr. Booth himself, who now protests because the Council did not correspond.

The action of the Board referring the matter back to the Presbytery of Brooklyn was taken November 7th, and was communicated to the Presbytery by me in a letter to the Rev. Frederick Campbell, D.D., Stated Clerk, dated November 9th, a copy of which I enclose (enclosure

#3). This letter was approved by Dr. Alexander, Mr. Stewart, Dr. Cobb, Dr. Booth, Dr. Fox and the Executive Council.

The reply of the Presbytery of Brooklyn was as follows:

"The Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D. D., Dec.1,1904.
Sec'y. Board of Foreign Missions.

Dear Brother:-

Replying to the letter of the Board of Foreign Missions of Nov. 9th ult., addressed by you as Secretary to the Presbytery of Brooklyn through me as Stated Clerk of the body, I respectfully report that, at its stated meeting held on Monday, Nov. 28th, the Presbytery adopted the following resolution:

"Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only "men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its "recognition that the determination of that soundness is the "concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. "It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the "examination for ordination of the Rev. Mr. Field and the Rev. "Mr. Gleysteen special attention was paid to their belief in the "important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that "they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in "their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

Yours truly,
(signed) Frederick Campbell,
Stated Clerk, Presbytery of Brooklyn."

I enclose herewith (enclosure #4) the policy of the Board adopted May 6th, 1902.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

May 22nd, 1905.

My Dear Dr. Brown:-

Your telegram is just received. Your letter to Mr. Campbell reporting the action of the Board of November 7th, is torn out of the letter book, but I send a copy of it which is found in your files.

I am sending also the letters from Mr. Campbell. Miss McCollough says that these are all there are in the files.

I hope there may be no trouble over the matter.

Very affectionately yours,

Robt. E. Speer

In case you might need it I send also your special file on Glyster case. This goes by express registered mail.

ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD - November 7th., 1904.

The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Glaysteen and Field, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Presbytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question, and that meanwhile, the Council be directed to refrain from further action under the Resolution of October 17th.

The Board directed the Secretaries to express to Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field its great regret that it had been found necessary to raise any question as to sending them to the foreign field. It particularly wishes to express to Mr. Gleysteen its sympathy in the distress caused by the illness of his father, and assures him that the prayers of the Board will be offered in his behalf.

ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD - November 7th., 1904.

The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Glaysteen and Field, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Presbytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question, and that meanwhile, the Council be directed to refrain from further action under the Resolution of October 17th.

The Board directed the Secretaries to express to Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field its great regret that it had been found necessary to raise any question as to sending them to the foreign field. It particularly wishes to express to Mr. Gleysteen its sympathy in the distress caused by the illness of his father, and assures him that the prayers of the Board will be offered in his behalf.

Copy

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

Approved by Dr. Alexander, Dr. Richards, Mr. Speer, Mr. Hand and Mr. Lamb, Stewart Cobb

Nov. 9th., 1904.

To the Presbytery of Brooklyn,

The Rev. Frederick Campbell, D.D., Stated Clerk,

Brooklyn, New York.

Bd action

Dear Brethren:

The statement has been made to the Board that the Rev. Frank E. Field and the Rev. Wm. H. Gleysteen, members of your Presbytery who are under appointment to the foreign field, are radically defective in their views of certain fundamental evangelical doctrines particularly "the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards." The Board would fain believe that the statement rests upon a misapprehension, especially as it has received your communication of October 25th renewing the recommendation of the Presbytery that these brethren be sent to the foreign field. The statement, however, is definitely and positively made and you will appreciate the Board's disturbance of mind. It would be a serious matter from the viewpoint of justice to Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen as well as from the viewpoint of the interests of foreign missions if these brethren were to go to the foreign field with such a cloud hanging over them.

We hesitate to bring the matter to your attention as we remember that you have already examined these brethren for ordination, and yet we are sure that the Presbytery will appreciate the embarrassment of the situation and the desirability of clearing up any misapprehension that may be found to exist. The foreign missionary in Asia is a leader and a moulder of thought to a far greater extent than the average minister at home so that his position regarding the central

doctrines of evangelical faith becomes of unusual importance. You will agree with us that it would be harmful to the cause we all love if the charge were to be made that the Board is appointing men who deny a cardinal truth of the Gospel unless the Board is in a position to reply that it has specially referred that statement to the Presbytery involved, and that the Presbytery declared the statement to be unfounded. The Board would then be able to state authoritatively that that particular fact has been enquired into with satisfactory results.

While therefore, the Board does not wish to question the validity of the action that you have already taken, yet in view of the special responsibility that the Board sustains to the foreign missionaries under its care and to the Church as their sponsers, it deemed it wise, at its meeting the 7th instant, to take the following action:-

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Presbytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question.

The Board directed the Secretaries to express to Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field its great regret that it had been found necessary to raise any question as to sending them to the foreign field. It particularly wishes to express to Mr. Gleysteen its sympathy in the distress caused by the illness of his father, and assures him that the prayers of the Board will be offered in his behalf."

You will of course understand that this action of the Board is not intended to indicate any opinion as to the correctness or incorrectness of the statement referred to, but that it is simply ~~fax~~ a request for your judgment.

On behalf of the Board,

Arthur J. Brown

Secretary.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

Board Nov. 7, 1904

November 9th., 1904.

The Rev. Wm. H. Gleysteen,
Alton, Iowa.

Letter approved by Drs Alexander, Richards, Stewart, Speer, Hand Garritt Co 66.

My dear Mr. Gleysteen:

I was absent from the city for two and a half weeks on my annual tour among the Synods so that I did not see at once your letter and telegram which arrived during that time. I was stricken with sorrow for you when I read the pathetic words in your message- "Father is dying." I am glad to know that he is still with you and I trust, my dear brother, that you may be conscious in a very comforting and strengthening way of the presence of Christ in this hour of special need.

At such a time I hesitate to write about other matters knowing that your heart must be full of tender solicitude for your father; and yet I know that you are making your plans to sail for China, and that both you and your father expect to know how the case stood at the meeting of the Board yesterday. I write about it not by instruction or as an official, but personally, as it appears only just that you should know the situation.

The complaint to Synod was, as you know, withdrawn, but of course the actions of the Presbytery were matters of record, and as it is one of the routine duties of each Synod to review the records of the Presbyteries under its care, the procedure in connection with the reception and ordination of yourself and Mr. Field came up in that way. The Synod took the following exceptions to the actions of Presbytery:

"That at the Meeting held June 29th, 1904 (P.294) the Presbytery received two persons as candidates for the ministry in violation of Constitutional Rule #3.

That in the Meetings of March 29th and Oct. 3rd, 1904, candidates were received under the care of Presbytery without record that they had complied with the requirements of Constitutional Rule #3."

The Stated Clerk of the Synod writes in interpretation that "the Synod did not void the ordinations, but that exceptions were taken to their irregularity" and that "the Synod directs the Presbytery of Brooklyn to observe in the future all the requirements of the Constitution." The Presbytery apparently feels that there is now no obstacle so far as the Synod is concerned, and under date of Oct. 5th, the Stated Clerk, the Rev. Frederick Campbell, D.D., took the following action:-

"Whereas, owing to the fact that a complaint was taken to the Synod of New York against certain actions of the Presbytery in the matter of the ordination of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen, the Board of Foreign Missions has delayed sending them to the foreign field, and,

Whereas, the said complaint has been withdrawn and the way is now cleared for their commission, therefore be it

Resolved that the Presbytery of Brooklyn renews its recommendation of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen as candidates for appointment to the foreign field and cordially recommends them to the Board."

The present delay therefore is due not so much to the action of the Synod, as to the discovery that the five members of the Presbytery, in withdrawing their complaint to the Synod, did so in the following written statement:-

"New York City, Oct. 5, 1904.

The undersigned, members of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, whose names were attached to the complaint of July 16th last, addressed to the Synod of New York, having received from the appointed committee of Presbytery a copy of the resolution of Presbytery, requesting the withdrawal of the complaint, do hereby express their compliance with said request, by authorizing the complaint to be withdrawn.

In do doing, the undersigned desire it to be distinctly understood that the step which they now take is not due to any change of conviction as to the things complained of or the grounds on which complaint was made. But, it being manifest by expressions of members in Presbytery that the object of the complaint is already largely ac-

complished, we entertain hope that in the future a strict adherence to Presbyterian doctrine and law will obviate the necessity of repeating the step which we have taken solely as a matter of principle and with very deep pain; and we accept the assurances given us by Presbytery that irregularities such as are complained of will not be repeated. We further state that our withdrawal of complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the Committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards.

Lewis Ray Foote,
Frederick Campbell,
(signed)--- Walter M. Aikman,
Darwin R. James,
Eliphalet B. Terry. "

The implication of the last sentence appears to be that in the cases referred to, the Presbytery did ordain men "who deny the doctrine of the Atonement". Dr. Carson, the Chairman of the Presbytery which waited upon the complainants, declares that his Committee did not accept any such implication, but two of the complainants have stated to the Board that in their judgment you and Mr. Field did deny the doctrine of the Atonement and they insist that the full written statement of the complainants quoted above must be made a matter of record by the Presbytery.

The Board feels that in justice to you and Mr. Field as well as to itself the Presbytery should clear up this matter, and accordingly at the meeting of the Board yesterday (the 7th instant) the matter was referred back to the Presbytery for such action. The next meeting of the Presbytery will be held the 28th of this month and the following meeting of the Board will be held December 5th. It is necessary therefore to wait until that time.

Meantime the Board at its meeting yesterday expressed deep sympathy for you in your anxiety about your father and unanimously adopted the following resolution which I was instructed to send to you.-

"The Board directed the Secretaries to express to Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field its great regret that it had been found necessary to raise any question as to sending them to the foreign field. It particularly wishes to express to Mr. Gleysteen its sympathy in the distress caused by the illness of his father, and assures him that the prayers of the Board will be offered in his behalf."

I send a copy of this letter to Mr. Field for his information.

Praying that God may lovingly guide you, I am as ever,

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

P.S. I have shown this letter to my colleagues and to Dr. Alexander, the President of the Board. The latter suggests that I "add a sentence expressing the hope that they (you and Mr. Field) would furnish the Presbytery such a statement of their belief as will enable the Presbytery to clear the matter up."

COPY .

My dear Dr. Brown:

I think your letter is excellent. My only question is whether it would not be more likely to elicit a statement satisfactory to the Presbytery and the Board if near the bottom of the third page after the words "It is necessary therefore to wait until that time" you added a sentence expressing the hope that ~~you~~ they would furnish such a statement of their belief as will enable the Presbytery to "clear the matter up." Perhaps they may then voluntarily make their position plain to the Board as well as to the Presbytery.

I hold firmly that the Board should not constitute itself a court of review, but after all that has occurred these young men cannot be sent with the confidence and approval of the Board unless the Board itself is relieved of the fear that they are vitally unsound on the doctrine of the Atonement.

Faithfully yours,

(signed) George Alexander.

Nov. 9, 1904.

This belongs in file of Special Field & Gleysteen, case

Copy.

428-1/2 Clinton St., Brooklyn,
N.Y., Dec.1,1904.

The Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D. D., Sec'y. Board of Foreign Missions,

Dear Brother:-

Replying to the letter of the Board of Foreign Missions of Nov. 9th ult., addressed by you as Secretary to the Presbytery of Brooklyn through me as Stated Clerk of the body, I respectfully report that, at its stated meeting held on Monday, Nov. 28th, the Presbytery adopted the following resolution:

"Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only "men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition "that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries "rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's in-"quiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. Mr. Field and "the Rev. Mr. Gleysteen special attention was paid to their belief in the "important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they ~~so~~ ap-"proved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and "they were accordingly ordained."

Yours truly,

(signed) Frederick Campbell,
Stated Clerk, Presbytery of
Brooklyn.

Dec 24, 1904

Presbytery for at least one year, except in extraordinary cases and by consent of three-fourths of the members of Presbytery present." The Presbytery of Brooklyn decided that their cases came under the general category of "extraordinary cases," and by a three-fourths majority set aside the rule, examined and ordained them. A small minority (five) however, dissented, raising some questions as to the regularity of the proceeding and as to the soundness of Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen on the doctrine of the Atonement.

The Synod in reviewing the case as it appeared in the Presbyterial records, held that the Presbytery was technically irregular in its procedure, but left the ordination of the young men unimpaired. Those who know them best did not for a moment believe that they were unsound, but the Board felt that in justice to them as well as to the work, it would be unfortunate if they were to go to the field without a special inquiry which would permit them of an authoritative reply to any possible misapprehension. Accordingly the Board referred the matter back to Presbytery, asking that body to make a special report on the subject. Some of the members of Presbytery were rather indignant that the question should be raised in this way, feeling that the fact of examination and ordination by Presbytery should have been deemed a sufficient guarantee of soundness. However, the Presbytery took up the matter again and November 28th took the following action:

"Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. F. E. Field and the Rev. William Gleysteen special attention was paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

We are informed by a member of the Presbytery that there was only one dissenting voice, the action being otherwise the unanimous judgment

of the Presbytery at a largely attended meeting. Members of the Presbytery assure us that the examination of these young men was unusually thorough, that their views on all important questions of Christian doctrine were fully brought out and that they are in every way worthy of the confidence of the Board and of the Church.

These facts were reported to the Board at its meeting December 5th, when Mr. Gheysteen and Mr. Field were promptly authorized to sail for China.

We do not know that you need this explanation, and yet it seemed wise to give it in view of the possibility that you may have heard some disturbing statements. The Secretaries of the Board personally know Mr. Field, and so far as we can judge from our own observation and correspondence, and from what has been told us by other men who know him well and whose intelligence and soundness in the faith are undoubted, he is a man admirably qualified for missionary work, and we have no hesitation in commending him to your entire confidence.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

Resolution of Presbytery - Campbell

RECEIVED
OCT 26 1904

F. Campbell. Dr. Brown.

4

Whereas, owing to the fact that a complaint was taken to the Synod of New York against certain actions of the Presbytery in the matter of the ordination of Mesrrs. Field and Gleysteen, the Board of Foreign Missions has delayed sending them to the foreign field; and

Whereas, the said complaint has been withdrawn and the way is now cleared for their commission, therefore be it

Resolved that the Presbytery of Brooklyn renews its recommendation of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen as candidates for appointment to the foreign field and cordially recommends them to the Board.

OCT 25 1904

5

The Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D., Secretary:
Dear Brother:

The Presbytery of Brooklyn adopted the above resolution at its stated meeting yesterday.

Yours truly,

Frederick A. Campbell

RECEIVED
NOV 4 1904
Dr. Brown

5

428 1/2 Clinton-St., Brooklyn, N.Y., Nov. 4, 1904.

Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D., Secretary:

F. Campbell.

My Dear Dr. Brown:

Your letter of this day making inquiry concerning the withdrawal of the complaint to Synod against the Presbytery of Brooklyn, in the matter of the case of Rev. Messrs. Field and Gleysteen, is just in my hands, and I hasten to make early reply according to your desire.

You ask, first: "Has the above statement of the complainants been made a matter of record by the Presbytery?" I answer that the statement of the complainants made in connection with the withdrawal of their complaint was not made a matter of record by the Presbytery in the sense of being spread upon the Minutes of the body; nor was it read to the Presbytery in its complete form as placed in the hands of Presbytery's committee.

You ask, secondly: "Has the Presbytery made any reply?" I answer that Presbytery made no reply, not having heard the statement.

You ask, thirdly: "Will you send me a copy of all the proceedings of the Presbytery relating to the withdrawal of the complaint including any action that the Presbytery may have taken regarding it?" I answer that the following is a copy of the Minutes of Presbytery so far as they relate to the withdrawal of the complaint and any action that the Presbytery has taken regarding it:

Adjourned Meeting, Oct. 3, 1904: "The following resolution was presented by Rev. Dr. J.F.Carson, and adopted: "The Presbytery of Brooklyn, having listened to the reading of a complaint filed with the Clerk of the Synod of New York, against a certain action of the Presbytery, would most earnestly request the complainants to consider if the peace and harmony of the presbytery, and the interests of the kingdom of Christ will not be conserved by the withdrawal of the said complaint at this stage. The Presbytery has the more confidence in presenting to the complainants this request for the withdrawal of the complaint in view of the fact that the filing of the complaint and the discussion thereby evoked have in a measure served the ends for which it was presented." Rev. Drs. Carson, R.G.Hutchins, McAfee, and Elder Pearson, were appointed ~~a/committee~~ to convey Presbytery's resolutions to the complainants."

Stated Meeting, Oct. 24, 1904: "The report of the committee to confer with complainants to Synod was read by Dr. J.F.Carson, stating that the complaint had been withdrawn; report was accepted. The following resolution was adopted:" -- then follows in full the resolution, renewing the recommendation of Rev. Messrs. Field and Gleysteen for the foreign field, which has already been placed in your hands in full.

Very sincerely yours,

Frederick Campbell,
Stated Clerk, Presbytery of
Brooklyn.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

November 9th,1904.

To the Presbytery of Brooklyn,

The Rev. Frederick Campbell, D. D., Stated Clerk,

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dear Brethren:-

The statement has been made to the Board that the Rev. Frank M. Field and the Rev. Wm. H. Gleysteen, members of your Presbytery who are under appointment to the foreign field, are radically defective in their views of certain fundamental evangelical doctrines particularly "the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards." The Board would fain believe that the statement rests upon a misapprehension, especially as it has received your communication of October 25th renewing the recommendation of the Presbytery that these brethren be sent to the foreign field. The statement, however, is definitely and positively made and you will appreciate the Board's disturbance of mind. It would be a serious matter from the viewpoint of justice to Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen as well as from the viewpoint of the interests of foreign missions if these brethren were to go to the foreign field with such a cloud hanging over them.

We hesitate to bring the matter to your attention as we remember that you have already examined these brethren for ordination, and yet we are sure that the Presbytery will appreciate the embarrassment of the situation and the desirability of clearing up any misapprehension that may be found to exist. The foreign missionary in Asia is a leader and a moulder of thought to a far greater extent than the average minister at home so that his position regarding the central

doctrines of evangelical faith becomes of unusual importance. You will agree with us that it would be harmful to the cause we all love if the charge were to be made that the Board is appointing men who deny a cardinal truth of the Gospel unless the Board is in a position to reply that it has especially referred that statement to the Presbytery involved, and that the Presbytery declared that the statement to be unfounded. The Board would then be able to state authoritatively that that particular fact has been inquired into with satisfactory results.

While, therefore, the Board does not wish to question the validity of the action that you have already taken, yet in view of the special responsibility that the Board sustains to the foreign missionaries under its care and to the Church as their sponsers, it deemed it wise, at its meeting the 7th instant, to take the following action:-

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Presbytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question.

The Board directed the Secretaries to express to Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field its great regret that it had been found necessary to raise any question as to sending them to the foreign field. It particularly wishes to express to Mr. Gleysteen its sympathy in the distress caused by the illness of his father, and assures him that the prayers of the Board will be offered in his behalf."

You will of course understand that this action of the Board is not intended to indicate any opinion as to the correctness of incorrectness of the statement referred to, but that it is simply a request for your judgment.

On behalf of the Board,

(signed) Arthur J. Brown,

Secretary.

Copies

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Approved by Drs Alexander & Richards, Stewart and Messrs Speer & Hand, Garritt, Cobb

November 9th., 1904.

The Rev. Wm. H. Gleysteen,

Alton, Iowa.

My dear Mr. Gleysteen:

I was absent from the city for two and a half weeks on my annual tour among the Synods so that I did not see at once your letter and telegram which arrived during that time. I was stricken with sorrow for you when I read the pathetic words in your message- "Father is dying." I am glad to know that he is still with you and I trust, my dear brother, that you may be conscious in a very comforting and strengthening way of the presence of Christ in this hour of special need.

At such a time I hesitate to write about other matters knowing that your heart must be full of tender solicitude for your father; and yet I know that you are making your plans to sail for China, and that both you and your father expect to know how the case stood at the meeting of the Board yesterday. I write about it not by instruction or as an official, but personally, as it appears only just that you should know the situation.

The complaint to Synod was, as you know, withdrawn, but of course the actions of the Presbytery were matters of record, and as it is one of the routine duties of each Synod to review the records of the Presbyteries under its care, the procedure in connection with the reception and ordination of yourself and Mr. Field came up in that way. The Synod took the following exceptions to the actions of Presbytery:

"That at the Meeting held June 29th, 1904 (P.294) the Presbytery received two persons as candidates for the ministry in violation of Constitutional Rule #3.

That in the Meetings of March 28th and Oct. 3rd, 1904, candidates were received under the care of Presbytery without record that they had complied with the requirements of Constitutional Rule #3."

The Stated Clerk of the Synod writes in interpretation that "the Synod did not void the ordinations, but that exceptions were taken to their irregularity" and that "the Synod directs the Presbytery of Brooklyn to observe in the future all the requirements of the Constitution." The Presbytery apparently feels that there is now no obstacle so far as the Synod is concerned, and under date of Oct. 5th, the Stated Clerk, the Rev. Frederick Campbell, D.D., took the following action:-

"Whereas, owing to the fact that a complaint was taken to the Synod of New York against certain actions of the Presbytery in the matter of the ordination of Messrs, Field and Gleysteen, the Board of Foreign Missions has delayed sending them to the foreign field, and,

Whereas, the said complaint has been withdrawn and the way is now cleared for their commission, therefore be it

Resolved that the Presbytery of Brooklyn renews its recommendation of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen as candidates for appointment to the foreign field and cordially recommends them to the Board."

The present delay therefore is due not so much to the action of the Synod, as to the discovery that the five members of the Presbytery, in withdrawing their complaint to the Synod, did so in the following written statement:-

"New York City, Oct. 5, 1904.

The undersigned, members of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, whose names were attached to the complaint of July 16th last, addressed to the Synod of New York, having received from the appointed committee of Presbytery a copy of the resolution of Presbytery, requesting the withdrawal of the complaint, do hereby express their compliance with said request, by authorizing the complaint to be withdrawn.

In do doing, the undersigned desire it to be distinctly understood that the step which they now take is not due to any change of conviction as to the things complained of or the grounds on which complaint was made. But, it being manifest by expressions of members in Presbytery that the object of the complaint is already largely ac-

complished, we entertain hope that in the future a strict adherence to Presbyterian doctrine and law will obviate the necessity of repeating the step which we have taken solely as a matter of principle and with very deep pain; and we accept the assurances given us by Presbytery that irregularities such as are complained of will not be repeated. We further state that our withdrawal of complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the Committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards.

Lewis Ray Foote,
Frederick Campbell,
(signed)--- Walter M. Aikman,
Darwin R. James,
Eliphalet B. Terry. "

The implication of the last sentence appears to be that in the cases referred to, the Presbytery did ordain men "who deny the doctrine of the Atonement". Dr. Carson, the Chairman of the Presbytery which waited upon the complainants, declares that his Committee did not accept any such implication, but two of the complainants have stated to the Board that in their judgment you and Mr. Field did deny the doctrine of the Atonement and they insist that the full written statement of the complainants quoted above must be made a matter of record by the Presbytery.

The Board feels that in justice to you and Mr. Field as well as to itself the Presbytery should clear up this matter, and accordingly at the meeting of the Board yesterday (the 7th instant) the matter was referred back to the Presbytery for such action. The next meeting of the Presbytery will be held the 28th of this month and the following meeting of the Board will be held December 5th. It is necessary therefore to wait until that time.

Meantime the Board at its meeting yesterday expressed deep sympathy for you in your anxiety about your father and unanimously adopted the following resolution which I was instructed to send to you.-

"The Board directed the Secretaries to express to Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field its great regret that it had been found necessary to raise any question as to sending them to the foreign field. It particularly wishes to express to Mr . Gleysteen its sympathy in the distress caused by the illness of his father, and assures him that the prayers of the Board will be offered in his behalf."

I send a copy of this letter to Mr. Field for his information.

Praying that God may lovingly guide you, I am as ever,

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J Brown

P.S. I have shown this letter to my colleagues and to Dr. Alexander, the President of the Board. The latter suggests that I "add a sentence expressing the hope that they (you and Mr. Field) would furnish the Presbytery such a statement of their belief aswill enable the Presbytery to clear the matter up."

Referring to G. J. Brown's letter of Nov 9, to Mr. Glysteen & Mr. Field

COPY .

My dear Dr. Brown:

I think your letter is excellent. My only question is whether it would not be more likely to elicit a statement satisfactory to the Presbytery and the Board if near the bottom of the third page after the words "It is necessary therefore to wait until that time" you added a sentence expressing the hope that ~~you~~ they would furnish such a statement of their belief as will enable the Presbytery to "clear the matter up." Perhaps they may then voluntarily make their position plain to the Board as well as to the Presbytery.

I hold firmly that the Board should not constitute itself a court of review, but after all that has occurred these young men cannot be sent with the confidence and approval of the Board unless the Board itself is relieved of the fear that they are vitally unsound on the doctrine of the Atonement.

Faithfully yours,

(signed) George Alexander.

Nov. 9, 1904.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

July 20th, 1904.

Rev. Newell W. Wells,
219 So. 9th St.,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

My dear Mr. Wells:

Will you kindly have the enclosed blanks filled out and returned to me in the cases of Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen recently examined and passed on by Brooklyn Presbytery. You will see by the enclosed copy of Board action that it is absolutely necessary for us to have these papers in our possession.

Cordially yours,

(Signed) A. W. Halsey,

Enc.

428½ CLINTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

OCT 12 1904

Fred. Campbell

Dear Brother:

The complaint to Synod will be withdrawn today.

Yours

Frederick Campbell.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.
OCT 12
1130 AM
1904

BROOKLYN, N.Y. STA. B
OCT 12
PM
1904

THE SPACE ABOVE IS RESERVED FOR POSTMARK.

POSTAL CARD.

THE SPACE BELOW IS FOR THE ADDRESS ONLY.

The
Rev. Wm J. Hutchins,
1327 Dean St.,
Brooklyn.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A.B.C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

Sept. 27th., 1904.

The Rev. Wm. H. Gleysteen,
Alton, Iowa.

My dear Mr. Gleysteen:-

Your letter of the 22nd instant arrived Saturday, and as the Presbytery was to meet Monday, it appeared wise to defer my answer till the result was known. This morning we received the long expected certificates from the Rev. Frederick Campbell, Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, to the effect that you and Mr. Field "are members of good standing of the Presbytery and that on the 26th instant, after an adequate and satisfactory examination" you and Mr. Field "were by special vote, recommended to the Board as possessing the requisite qualifications for foreign missionary work." We are verbally informed, however, that the complaint to Synod is persisted in, so that the proceedings of the Presbytery will have to be reviewed by that body.

Now, of course, the question arises whether the Board and you and Mr. Field should regard the matter as settled and sail at once for China, or whether it be better to wait until after the meeting of Synod. We appreciate the feeling of suspense indicated in your letter and the strain which the whole matter is causing you. Some are of the opinion that the Board would be within its technical rights in regarding the action of the Presbytery as final and in sending you and Mr. Field to China at once. This position is strengthened by the statement which a prominent member of the Presbytery made to us this morning to the effect that the complaint to Synod does not affect the fact of your ordination or involve a doubt as to your

doctrinal soundness but only the question as to the regularity of the Presbytery's action so that the complaint is against the Presbytery and not against you and Mr. Field.

If, however, you and Mr. Field were to leave at once for China without waiting for the Synod's action, it is quite probable that there would be some both in the Board and in the Presbytery and possibly in the Synod also who might feel that we had acted with undue haste. They might even interpret such action as a defiance of the Synod, or at least as a disregard of the courtesies of the situation. We fear that in any event the feeling might be intensified.

In the circumstances, does it not commend itself to your judgment and to Mr. Field's as well as to ours, that it would be the more Christian course to be patient and dignified and conciliatory? In a life service on the foreign field, a few weeks more or less in the date of departure count for little. So far as the work is concerned, there is no reason why you and Mr. Field could not sail in November as well as in October. By taking this course, you and Mr. Field and the Board would be in a position of quiet dignity which I am sure would win the respect and good will of all concerned. We are quite satisfied that you and Mr. Field will feel that this would be more satisfactory in the long run than to take an earlier start and leave behind a feeling of bitterness in the minds of brethren who are quite conscientious in their opposition to the course which the Presbytery took.

I might add that the Rev. Frank Campbell, the Stated Clerk, in a call the other day, stated that he had not received the blanks from the Board prior to the meeting of Presbytery which ordained you, and that he did not know that such blanks were required until he received them several days afterward, when he of course had no

authority to fill them out, no motion recommending you to the Board having been made in the Presbytery. Dr. Halsey says that the blanks were sent to the former stated clerk, Dr. Wells, Dr. Halsey not knowing that a change had been made in the office, which will account for the fact that while they were sent from this office, Mr. Campbell did not get them in time.

For the reasons above indicated, it seems to us wiser to wait until the Synod has acted. Meantime, the Council hopes that you and Mr. Field will not make any plans to remain in this country for a year. So far as we can judge from Dr. McAfee's statement to us this morning of what occurred in Presbytery as well as from the general situation, there is little reason to anticipate any action of Synod that would delay your departure. The need on the field is urgent, and we think it would be wiser for you both to hold yourselves in readiness to start as soon as possible after the meeting of the Synod.

Praying that God may guide you and bless you both, I remain, as ever,

Affectionately yours,

P. S. I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Field.

Dr. Ellinwood

Copy.

October 26th,1904.

My dear Mr. Speer:

I am confidently hoping that I may be able to go to the office to-morrow, Thursday morning, and shall aim to be there at ten o'clock, and if you are at liberty we shall confer together in the case of Messrs. Gleysteen and Field.

The fact that the Synod has traversed the action of the Presbytery, and has sanctioned the same, well knowing that a protest had been made and withdrawn, would render it still more embarrassing for the Board to take up the case and virtually overrule the action of both Presbytery and Synod. You well remember, as I do, the case of McGilvary of Laos. It was a more pronounced case of heresy by far than the present one. The missionary took the initiative and I might say challenged the Board to dismiss him. And some of his more intemperate friends assuming that we were going to do so, virtually defied us. Before we knew it the matter had gotten in the papers, and parties for and against began to take sides and to arraign the Board for an unwarranted act of tyranny. Meanwhile there were threats that the support of some of the churches would be withdrawn or greatly diminished, etc., etc. It seemed as if the enemy of all good was determined to make the Board the storm centre of a theological quarrel. When the matter was brought up in the Board it decided by a strong vote to leave the case where it had been placed in other similar situations in the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities of the Church. In this reference we found safety. The Mission Presbytery took action upon the case, but if I remember rightly Mr. McGilvary forestalled any ecclesiastical trial by resigning. I am not positive, however, as to that, but he soon appeared in one of the Universities of California as a teacher of Philosophy, and I think it became quite apparent that he had seriously

apostacised from the Christian faith.

On two occasions there have been reports of defection on the part of missionaries in Shantung, and the last case was that of Mr. Partch. In both instances when the matter came to the Board it was reported to the Presbytery and I believe the brethren withdrew their theological objections.

On general principle I think the only safety of the Board in its great and delicate work lies in refraining from anything like ecclesiastical functions or authority. The Digest of 1830 of which we were speaking the other day virtually upholds a general principle, while it states a partial objection. I can see how there might be cases in which pending a reference to the meeting of the next Assembly, the Board might call a halt as for instance in the McGilvary case, a sudden and unexpected defection had occurred, and flagrant error was being taught. Undoubtedly the Board in such a case would be justified in a stay of procedings until the case could be reported to the Assembly, or to some subordinate ecclesiastical tribunal. I think that some such exigency is all that that early Assembly intended.

But this case is wholly different. We should be sitting in judgment not upon these candidates, but upon the Presbytery of Brooklyn and the Synod of New York, and it would also call in question the action of two or three later Assemblies which dealt with conditions similar to those of the present case.

There are just now on both sides of the Atlantic many a conflicting re-statement of theoretical belief in regard to Scriptural authority and some of the doctrines which we deem of greatest importance.

My own deep conviction is that the Atonement of Christ is the foundation rock of the whole Gospel fabric. But what puzzles me is the fact that some of those who seem to differ from my theory of the Atonement are most earnest, practical believers, and are a great deal more efficient

missionaries than I should make if I were in their place.

Some men in whose preaching the vicarious sacrifice of Christ is constantly and earnestly implied, might falter when asked for a theoretic statement in Presbytery there oftentimes the outward form of the question is quite as much at fault as the reply of the candidate.

Just what course should be pursued, I cannot at the present clearly suggest, but in my opinion the Board should try hard to find some other way rather than to arraign the Presbytery of Brooklyn and the great Synod of New York. I think that a good deal might be done by personal influence. For example, it would be perfectly proper for you and Dr. Brown to fully explain the situation to these young brethren by correspondence, and fully satisfy yourselves as to the drift of their future teaching. Their replies might remove all objection, and this would be much better than formal action by the Board which would certainly bear an aspect more or less judicial.

Please glance over these points and let me know to-morrow morning any changes which you would suggest.

I am undertaking a most difficult thing, that is to get material for a Bulletin.

Yours very sincerely,

(signed) F.F.Ellinwood.

(Copy)

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

Nov. 4th., 1904.

The Rev. Frederick J. Campbell, D.D.,
Stated Clerk Presbytery Brooklyn,
423 1/2 Clinton St., Brooklyn.

My dear Dr. Campbell:

We have received your communication of Oct. 25th stating that the complaint to Synod in the case of the Revs. Wm. H. Gleysteen and Frank E. Field has been withdrawn and that the Presbytery renews its recommendation of these brethren as candidates for appointment to the foreign field.

We are informed that the complainants in withdrawing their complaint sent the following communication to the Presbytery)-

"New York City, Oct. 5, 1904.

The undersigned, members of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, whose names were attached to the complaint of July 16th, last, addressed to the Synod of New York, having received from the appointed committee of Presbytery a copy of the resolution of Presbytery, requesting the withdrawal of the complaint, do hereby express their compliance with said request, by authorizing the complaint to be withdrawn.

In so doing, the undersigned desire it to be distinctly understood that the step which they now take is not due to any change of conviction as to the things complained of or the grounds on which complaint was made. But, it being manifest by expressions of members in Presbytery that the object of the complaint is already largely accomplished, we entertain hope that in the future a strict adherence to Presbyterian doctrine and law will obviate the necessity of repeating the step which we have taken solely as a matter of principle and with very deep pain; and we accept the assurances given us by Presbytery that irregularities such as are complained of will not be repeated. We further state that our withdrawal of the complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards.

(signed.)-- Lewis Ray Foote,
Frederick J. Campbell,
Walter M. Aikman,
Darwin R. James,
Eliphalet B. Terry. "

We venture to inquire:-

First; Has the above statement of the complainants been made a

matter of record by the Presbytery?

Second; Has the Presbytery made any reply?

Third; Will you send me a copy of all the proceedings of the Presbytery relating to the withdrawal of the complaint including any action that the Presbytery may have taken regarding it?

As the matter will come before our Board for consideration Monday, an early reply will be highly appreciated. I enclose an addressed envelope with a special delivery stamp.

Enc.

Cordially yours,

Arthur J Brown

Geneva, N.Y., Nov. 1, 1904.

Dear Mr. Speer:

Enclosed find the exceptions (copy) taken to the Minutes of Brooklyn Presbytery, also the following action was taken "The Synod directs the Presbytery of Brooklyn to observe in the future all the requirements of the Constitution."

The Synod did not void the ordinations, but exceptions were taken to their irregularity and they were cautioned not to repeat it as you notice.

Yours very truly,

(signed) J. Wilford Jacks,

Stated Clerk of the Synod of New York.

Exceptions taken to Minutes of the Presbytery of Brooklyn.

(1) That on page 258 under date of Feb. 22, 1904, the arrangements for the installation of Rev. L. O. Rolenback over Bethany Church are indefinite as to date and mode of installation and that the meeting of March 10th at which Mr. Rolenback was installed is recorded out of its proper order. Nor is it recorded whether said meeting of March 10th was an adjourned or a pro re nota meeting.

(2) That with regard to the meeting of June 10th, 1904 (page 288) there is no record of the authority for the meeting; nor of any roll call; and ~~xf~~ only two members of Presbytery are specified as having been present.

(3) That on pages 239 and 240 (Jan. 14, 1904) it is recorded that the Presbytery organized a church by commission, only two members of the Presbytery being recorded as present.

(4) That with regard to the Meeting of June 7th, 1904, (p. 287)

there is no record of the authority by which such meeting was held, nor is it expressly stated where the meeting was held.

(5) That on April 25th, 1904 (p.280) the Presbytery sustained exceptions to the records of the Glenmore Avenue and Franklin Avenue churches, but no statement of the nature of these exceptions is recorded in the Minutes of the Presbytery.

(6) That at the meeting held June 29th,1904 (p.294) the Presbytery received two persons as candidates for the ministry in violation of Constitutional Rule #3.

(7) That at the Meeting on April 25th,(p.274) the application of Herbert H. Field to be taken under care of Presbytery was recorded as of improper date.

(8) That in the Meetings of March 28th and Oct. 3rd,1904, candidates were received under the care of Presbytery without record that they had complied with the requirements of Constitutional Rule #3.

(9) That the Minutes of Oct. 3rd and July 16th were not approved.

Geneva, N.Y., Nov. 1, 1904.

Dear Mr. Speer:

Enclosed find the exceptions (copy) taken to the Minutes of Brooklyn Presbytery, also the following action was taken "The Synod directs the Presbytery of Brooklyn to observe in the future all the requirements of the Constitution."

The Synod did not void the ordinations, but exceptions were taken to their irregularity and they were cautioned not to repeat it as you notice.

Yours very truly,

(signed) J. Wilford Jacks,

Stated Clerk of the Synod of

New York.

Exceptions taken to Minutes of the Presbytery of Brooklyn.

(1) That on page 258 under date of Feb. 22, 1904, the arrangements for the installation of Rev. L. O. Rolenback over Bethany Church are indefinite as to date and mode of installation and that the meeting of March 10th at which Mr. Rolenback was installed is recorded out of its proper order. Nor is it recorded whether said meeting of March 10th was an adjourned or a pro re nota meeting.

(2) That with regard to the meeting of June 10th, 1904 (page 288) there is no record of the authority for the meeting; nor of any roll call; and ~~ex~~ only two members of Presbytery are specified as having been present.

(3) That on pages 239 and 240 (Jan. 14, 1904) it is recorded that the Presbytery organized a church by commission, only two members of the Presbytery being recorded as present.

(4) That with regard to the Meeting of June 7th, 1904, (p. 287)

there is no record of the authority by which such meeting was held, nor is it expressly stated where the meeting was held.

(5) That on April 25th, 1904 (p.280) the Presbytery sustained exceptions to the records of the Glenmore Avenue and Franklin Avenue churches, but no statement of the nature of these exceptions is recorded in the Minutes of the Presbytery.

(6) That at the meeting held June 29th, 1904 (p.294) the Presbytery received two persons as candidates for the ministry in violation of Constitutional Rule #3.

(7) That at the Meeting on April 25th, (p.274) the application of Herbert H. Field to be taken under care of Presbytery was recorded as of improper date.

(8) That in the Meetings of March 28th and Oct. 3rd, 1904, candidates were received under the care of Presbytery without record that they had complied with the requirements of Constitutional Rule #3.

(9) That the Minutes of Oct. 3rd and July 16th were not approved.

Geneva, N.Y., Nov. 1, 1904.

Dear Mr. Speer:

Enclosed find the exceptions (copy) taken to the Minutes of Brooklyn Presbytery, also the following action was taken "The Synod directs the Presbytery of Brooklyn to observe in the future all the requirements of the Constitution."

The Synod did not void the ordinations, but exceptions were taken to their irregularity and they were cautioned not to repeat it as you notice.

Yours very truly,

(signed) J. Wilford Jacks,

Stated Clerk of the Synod of

New York.

Exceptions taken to Minutes of the Presbytery of Brooklyn.

(1) That on page 258 under date of Feb. 22, 1904, the arrangements for the installation of Rev. L. O. Rolenback over Bethany Church are indefinite as to date and mode of installation and that the meeting of March 10th at which Mr. Rolenback was installed is recorded out of its proper order. Nor is it recorded whether said meeting of March 10th was an adjourned or a pro re nota meeting.

(2) That with regard to the meeting of June 10th, 1904 (page 288) there is no record of the authority for the meeting; nor of any roll call; and if only two members of Presbytery are specified as having been present.

(3) That on pages 239 and 240 (Jan. 14, 1904) it is recorded that the Presbytery organized a church by commission, only two members of the Presbytery being recorded as present.

(4) That with regard to the Meeting of June 7th, 1904, (p. 287)

there is no record of the authority by which such meeting was held, nor is it expressly stated where the meeting was held.

(5) That on April 25th, 1904 (p.280) the Presbytery sustained exceptions to the records of the Glenmore Avenue and Franklin Avenue churches, but no statement of the nature of these exceptions is recorded in the minutes of the Presbytery.

(6) That at the meeting held June 29th, 1904 (p.294) the Presbytery received two persons as candidates for the ministry in violation of Constitutional Rule #3.

(7) That at the Meeting on April 25th, (p.274) the application of Herbert H. Field to be taken under care of Presbytery was recorded as of improper date.

(8) That in the Meetings of March 28th and Oct. 3rd, 1904, candidates were received under the care of Presbytery without record that they had complied with the requirements of Constitutional Rule #3

(9) That the Minutes of Oct. 3rd and July 16th were not approved.

Geneva, N.Y., Nov. 1, 1904.

Dear Mr. Speer:

Enclosed find the exceptions (copy) taken to the Minutes of Brooklyn Presbytery, also the following action was taken "The Synod directs the Presbytery of Brooklyn to observe in the future all the requirements of the Constitution."

The Synod did not void the ordinations, but exceptions were taken to their irregularity and they were cautioned not to repeat it as you notice.

Yours very truly,

(signed) J. Wilford Jacks,

Stated Clerk of the Synod of New York.

Exceptions taken to Minutes of the Presbytery of Brooklyn.

(1) That on page 258 under date of Feb. 22, 1904, the arrangements for the installation of Rev. L. O. Rolenback over Bethany Church are indefinite as to date and mode of installation and that the meeting of March 15th at which Mr. Rolenback was installed is recorded out of its proper order. Nor is it recorded whether said meeting of March 15th was an adjourned or a pro re nota meeting.

(2) That with regard to the meeting of June 16th, 1904 (page 288) there is no record of the authority for the meeting; nor of any roll call; and as only two members of Presbytery are specified as having been present.

(3) That on pages 239 and 240 (Jan. 14, 1904) it is recorded that the Presbytery organized a church by commission, only two members of the Presbytery being recorded as present.

(4) That with regard to the Meeting of June 7th, 1904, (p. 287)

there is no record of the authority by which such meeting was held, nor is it expressly stated where the meeting was held.

(5) That on April 25th, 1904 (p.280) the Presbytery sustained exceptions to the records of the Glenmore Avenue and Franklin Avenue churches, but no statement of the nature of these exceptions is recorded in the Minutes of the Presbytery.

(6) That at the meeting held June 28th, 1904 (p.294) the Presbytery received two persons as candidates for the ministry in violation of Constitutional Rule #3.

(7) That at the Meeting on April25th, (p.274) the application of Herbert H. Field to be taken under care of Presbytery was recorded as of improper date.

(8) That in the Meetings of March 28th and Oct. 3rd, 1904, candidates were received under the care of Presbytery without record that they had complied with the requirements of Constitutional Rule #3

(9) That the Minutes of Oct. 3rd and July 16th were not approved.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2.

Dictated. Dec. 23rd., 1904.

Rev. Wm. R. Richards, D. D.,
14 E. 37th St., City.

My dear Dr. Richards:

Inasmuch as you honored me with a request for my opinion in regard to the case of the two young missionaries, Field and Gleysteen, please allow me to express more clearly in writing the view which I very imprefectly expressed by word of mouth.

There are two considerations in support of the Board's position which I think are of the greatest importance. One is, that it differs widely from those cases in which the missionary has developed heresy on the field - changed his front so to speak - in the fact that our first and only knowledge of any defection in these men came through the Presbytery itself, and as a result of its examination. The initiative was with the Presbytery, so that really the ground of the complaint was against that body and not against the young men. It was upon the propriety or impropriety of the Presbyterial action that the Board was asked to sit in judgment. It looks to me like a direct issue between the courts of the Church - for the Synod also was finally involved - and a Board of Missions which is no part of our ecclesiastical organization, and which has no judicial function on questions of doctrine. If this be correct, the three protestants are virtually complaining of the Board for obeying the mandates of the General Assembly more than once repeated, and the Presbyterian Church is asked to stultify itself by the rebuke and overthrow of its own fundamental principles of action.

The other consideration which I would emphasize, is the exemption or immunity which the Board has repeatedly found in the simple rule of referring such vexed questions to the ecclesiastical courts. It is a boon of such value that it should not lightly be relinquished.

We all witnessed a few years ago the terrible conflict which raged in the Congregational churches over the action of the Home Secretary of the American Board; a conflict which greatly disturbed all its missionary interests, and led to a diminition of funds. At that time an attempt made by certain parties to involve us in the quarrel, was speedily suppressed by a statement of our simple rule.

When somewhat later the Mc Gilvary case occurred, an effort was made by a brother-in-law of Mr. Mc Gilvary to make our Board a storm centre of a doctrinal discussion, and there were indications of a troublesome issue, but the Board was saved from all difficulty by disclaiming ecclesiastical authority, and leaving the matter in the hands of Presbytery.

In the present ferment of religious thought and discussion, which is likely to rather increase than diminish in the future, it would seem rash and suicidal to abandon the position in which the Foreign Missionary work of the Church has found so much security in the past.

Yours very sincerely,

(F. F. Ellinwood)

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

M.
MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX No. 2

Extra copies.

December 23rd, 1904.

To the Peking Mission,

Dear Friends:-

Some misleading statements have appeared in one or two church papers regarding the ordination of the Rev. William Gleysteen and that of his friend and classmate, the Rev. Frank E. Field, who sails with him for the West Shantung Mission. I do not know whether you have seen these statements, and I hope that you have not, but lest some rumor may have disturbed your mind, I have placed this letter in the hands of Mr. Gleysteen with the suggestion that he present it to you at his discretion.

He came from the Reformed Church to the Presbyterian Church, while Mr. Field came from the United Brethren in Christ. Although they had concluded some time ago that the Presbyterian Church was most in accord with their position and that they wished to give their lives to missionary work under the care of our Church, they deferred the formal transfer of their ecclesiastical relations until their papers had been passed upon by the Board so that they could know whether it could appoint them. The Board promptly decided in view of their exceptionally good qualifications that it would not only be willing, but glad to appoint them subject to the usual ordination by Presbytery.

When, however, they applied to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, they were apprised of the rule that "no person shall be received by Presbytery as a candidate for the ministry until he has been under the care of a session for a period of at least six months," and that "no candidate shall receive license to preach until he has been under the care of

Presbytery for at least one year, except in extraordinary cases and by consent of three-fourths of the members of Presbytery present." The Presbytery of Brooklyn decided that their cases came under the general category of "extraordinary cases," and by a three-fourths majority set aside the rule, examined and ordained them. A small minority (five) however, dissented, raising some questions as to the regularity of the proceeding and as to the soundness of Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen on the doctrine of the Atonement.

The Synod in reviewing the case as it appeared in the Presbyterial records, held that the Presbytery was technically irregular in its procedure, but left the ordination of the young men unimpaired. Those who knew them best did not for a moment believe that they were unsound, but the Board felt that in justice to them as well as to the work, it would be unfortunate if they were to go to the field without a special inquiry which would permit of an authoritative reply to any possible misapprehension. Accordingly the Board referred the matter back to Presbytery, asking that body to make a special report on the subject. Some of the members of the Presbytery were rather indignant that the question should be raised in this way, feeling that the fact of examination and ordination by Presbytery should have been deemed a sufficient guarantee of soundness. However, the Presbytery took up the matter again and November 28th took the following action:

"Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. F. S. Field and the Rev. Wm. Gleysteen special attention was paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

We are informed by a member of the Presbytery that there was only one dissenting voice, the action being otherwise the unanimous judgment

of the Presbytery at a largely attended meeting. Members of the Presbytery assure us that the examination of these young men was unusually thorough, that their views on all important questions of Christian doctrine were fully brought out, and that they are in every way worthy of the confidence of the Board and of the Church.

These facts were reported to the Board at its meeting December 5th, when Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field were promptly authorized to sail for China.

We do not know that you need this explanation, and yet it seemed wise to give it in view of the possibility that you may have heard some disturbing statements. The Secretaries of the Board personally know Mr. Gleysteen and so far as we can judge from our own observation and correspondence, and from what has been told us by other men who know him well and whose intelligence and soundness in the faith are undoubted, he is a man admirably qualified for missionary work, and we have no hesitation in commending him to your entire confidence.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J Brown

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX No. 2

December 24th, 1904.

To the West Chantung Mission,

Dear Friends:-

Some misleading statements have appeared in one or two of the church papers regarding the ordination of the Rev. Frank E. Field, and his friend and classmate, the Rev. William Gleysteen, who sails with him for the Peking Mission. I do not know whether you have seen these statements, and I hope that you have not, but lest some rumor may have disturbed your mind, I have placed this letter in the hands of Mr. Field with the suggestion that he present it to you at his discretion.

He came to the Presbyterian Church from the United Brethren in Christ, while Mr. Gleysteen came from the Reformed Church. Although they had concluded some time ago that the Presbyterian Church was most in accord with their position and that they wished to give their lives to missionary work under the care of our Church, they deferred the formal transfer of their ecclesiastical relations until their papers had been passed upon by the Board, so that they could know whether it could appoint them. The Board promptly decided in view of their exceptionally good qualifications that it would not only be willing, but glad to appoint them subject to the usual ordination by Presbytery.

When, however, they applied to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, they were ~~appeinted~~ apprised of the rule that "no person shall be received by Presbytery as a candidate for the ministry until he has been under the care of a session for a period of at least six months," and that "no candidate shall receive license to preach until he has been under the care of

Presbytery for at least one year, except in extraordinary cases and by consent of three-fourths of the members of Presbytery present." The Presbytery of Brooklyn decided that their cases came under the general category of "extraordinary cases," and by a three-fourths majority set aside the rule, examined and ordained them. A small minority (five) however, dissented, raising some questions as to the regularity of the proceeding and as to the soundness of Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen on the doctrine of the Atonement.

The Synod in reviewing the case as it appeared in the Presbyterial records, held that the Presbytery was technically irregular in its procedure, but left the ordination of the young men unimpaired. Those who know them best did not for a moment believe that they were unsound, but the Board felt that in justice to them as well as to the work, it would be unfortunate if they were to go to the field without a special inquiry which would permit them of an authoritative reply to any possible misapprehension. Accordingly the Board referred the matter back to Presbytery, asking that body to make a special report on the subject. Some of the members of Presbytery were rather indignant that the question should be raised in this way, feeling that the fact of examination and ordination by Presbytery should have been deemed a sufficient guarantee of soundness. However, the Presbytery took up the matter again and November 28th took the following action:

"Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. F. E. Field and the Rev. William Gleysteen special attention was paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

We are informed by a member of the Presbytery that there was only one dissenting voice, the action being otherwise the unanimous judgment

of the Presbytery at a largely attended meeting. Members of the Presbytery assure us that the examination of these young men was unusually thorough, that their views on all important questions of Christian doctrine were fully brought out and that they are in every way worthy of the confidence of the Board and of the Church.

These facts were reported to the Board at its meeting December 5th, when Mr. Gheysteen and Mr. Field were promptly authorized to sail for China.

We do not know that you need this explanation, and yet it seemed wise to give it in view of the possibility that you may have heard some disturbing statements. The Secretaries of the Board personally know Mr. Field, and so far as we can judge from our own observation and correspondence, and from what has been told us by other men who know him well and whose intelligence and soundness in the faith are undoubted, he is a man admirably qualified for missionary work, and we have no hesitation in commending him to your entire confidence.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX No. 2

December 24th, 1924.

To the West Shantung Mission,

Dear Friends:-

Some misleading statements have appeared in one or two of the church papers regarding the ordination of the Rev. Frank S. Field, and his friend and classmate, the Rev. William Gleysteen, who sails with him for the Peking Mission. I do not know whether you have seen these statements, and I hope that you have not, but lest some rumor may have disturbed your mind, I have placed this letter in the hands of Mr. Field with the suggestion that he present it to you at his discretion.

He came to the Presbyterian Church from the United Brethren in Christ, while Mr. Gleysteen came from the Reformed Church. Although they had concluded some time ago that the Presbyterian Church was most in accord with their position and that they wished to give their lives to missionary work under the care of our Church, they deferred the formal transfer of their ecclesiastical relations until their papers had been passed upon by the Board, so that they could know whether it could appoint them. The Board promptly decided in view of their exceptionally good qualifications that it would not only be willing, but glad to appoint them subject to the usual ordination by Presbytery.

When, however, they applied to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, they were ~~appointed~~ apprised of the rule that "no person shall be received by Presbytery as a candidate for the ministry until he has been under the care of a session for a period of at least six months," and that "no candidate shall receive license to preach until he has been under the care of

Presbytery for at least one year, except in extraordinary cases and by consent of three-fourths of the members of Presbytery present." The Presbytery of Brooklyn decided that their cases came under the general category of "extraordinary cases," and by a three-fourths majority set aside the rule, examined and ordained them. A small minority (five) however, dissented, raising some questions as to the regularity of the proceeding and as to the soundness of Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen on the doctrine of the Atonement.

The Synod in reviewing the case as it appeared in the Presbyterial records, held that the Presbytery was technically irregular in its procedure, but left the ordination of the young men unimpaired. Those who know them best did not for a moment believe that they were unsound, but the Board felt that in justice to them as well as to the work, it would be unfortunate if they were to go to the field without a special inquiry which would permit them of an authoritative reply to any possible misapprehension. Accordingly the Board referred the matter back to Presbytery, asking that body to make a special report on the subject. Some of the members of Presbytery were rather indignant that the question should be raised in this way, feeling that the fact of examination and ordination by Presbytery should have been deemed a sufficient guarantee of soundness. However, the Presbytery took up the matter again and November 28th took the following action:

"Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. F. E. Field and the Rev. William Gleysteen special attention was paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

We are informed by a member of the Presbytery that there was only one dissenting voice, the action being otherwise the unanimous judgment

of the Presbytery at a largely attended meeting. Members of the Presbytery assure us that the examination of these young men was unusually thorough, that their views on all important questions of Christian doctrine were fully brought out and that they are in every way worthy of the confidence of the Board and of the Church.

These facts were reported to the Board at its meeting December 5th, when Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field were promptly authorized to sail for China.

We do not know that you need this explanation, and yet it seemed wise to give it in view of the possibility that you may have heard some disturbing statements. The Secretaries of the Board personally know Mr. Field, and so far as we can judge from our own observation and correspondence, and from what has been told us by other men who know him well and whose intelligence and soundness in the faith are undoubted, he is a man admirably qualified for missionary work, and we have no hesitation in commending him to your entire confidence.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown

Final vote on Field - Glysteen Dec 5, 1904

Favored sailing -	Opposed
Richards	Booth
Cobb	Fox
Maitland	(Elder.) Stevenson
Mc Afee	Van Norden
Dennis	
Stewart	

Not voting

Ide

Patterson

Alexander (in chair)

James

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

Copy.

December 13th, 1904.

To the Peking Mission,

Dear Friends:-

The Rev. William Gleysteen, the new missionary of whose appointment and assignment to your Mission you have already been advised, expects to sail from San Francisco on the steamer "China" January 10th, and will be due in Shanghai February 5th. I know that you will be glad to have letters awaiting him in care of the Press in Shanghai, giving him welcome and any instructions that he may need. If you do not receive this in time to get letters back to Shanghai, you might telegraph him there. We hope that the harbor at Taku will not be ice-bound. If it is, would it not be well to advise him to study the language at some point in Shantung until he can get to Peking. He is, as you will recall from my former correspondence, a single man.

Mr. Gleysteen has been recently bereaved by the death of his father.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur J. Brown,
per McC.

(Same letter was sent to West Shantung Mission notifying them of Mr. Fields arrival.)

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

(3

November 9th,1904.

To the Presbytery of Brooklyn,

The Rev. Frederick Campbell, D. D., Stated Clerk,

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dear Brethren:-

The statement has been made to the Board that the Rev. Frank M. Field and the Rev. Wm. H. Gleysteen, members of your Presbytery who are under appointment to the foreign field, are radically defective in their views of certain fundamental evangelical doctrines particularly "the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards." The Board would fain believe that the statement rests upon a misapprehension, especially as it has received your communication of October 25th renewing the recommendation of the Presbytery that these brethren be sent to the foreign field. The statement, however, is definitely and positively made and you will appreciate the Board's disturbance of mind. It would be a serious matter from the viewpoint of justice to Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen as well as from the viewpoint of the interests of foreign missions if these brethren were to go to the foreign field with such a cloud hanging over them.

We hesitate to bring the matter to your attention as we remember that you have already examined these brethren for ordination, and yet we are sure that the Presbytery will appreciate the embarrassment of the situation and the desirability of clearing up any misapprehension that may be found to exist. The foreign missionary in Asia is a leader and a moulder of thought to a far greater extent than the average minister at home so that his position regarding the central

doctrines of evangelical faith becomes of unusual importance. You will agree with us that it would be harmful to the cause we all love if the charge were to be made that the Board is appointing men who deny a cardinal truth of the Gospel unless the Board is in a position to reply that it has especially referred that statement to the Presbytery involved, and that the Presbytery declared the statement to be unfounded. The Board would then be able to state authoritatively that that particular fact has been inquired into with satisfactory results.

While, therefore, the Board does not wish to question the validity of the action that you have already taken, yet in view of the special responsibility that the Board sustains to the foreign missionaries under its care and to the Church as their sponsors, it deemed it wise, at its meeting the 7th instant, to take the following action:-

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Presbytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question.

The Board directed the Secretaries to express to Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field its great regret that it had been found necessary to raise any question as to sending them to the foreign field. It particularly wishes to express to Mr. Gleysteen its sympathy in the distress caused by the illness of his father, and assures him that the prayers of the Board will be offered in his behalf."

You will of course understand that this action of the Board is not intended to indicate any opinion as to the correctness of incorrectness of the statement referred to, but that it is simply a request for your judgment.

On behalf of the Board,

(signed) Arthur J. Brown,

Secretary.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

November 9th,1904.

To the Presbytery of Brooklyn,

The Rev. Frederick Campbell, D. D., Stated Clerk,

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dear Brethren:-

The statement has been made to the Board that the Rev. Frank E. Field and the Rev. Wm. H. Gleysteen, members of your Presbytery who are under appointment to the foreign field, are radically defective in their views of certain fundamental evangelical doctrines particularly "the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards." The Board would fain believe that the statement rests upon a misapprehension, especially as it has received your communication of October 25th renewing the recommendation of the Presbytery that these brethren be sent to the foreign field. The statement, however, is definitely and positively made and you will appreciate the Board's disturbance of mind. It would be a serious matter from the viewpoint of justice to Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen as well as from the viewpoint of the interests of foreign missions if these brethren were to go to the foreign field with such a cloud hanging over them.

We hesitate to bring the matter to your attention as we remember that you have already examined these brethren for ordination, and yet we are sure that the Presbytery will appreciate the embarrassment of the situation and the desirability of clearing up any misapprehension that may be found to exist. The foreign missionary in Asia is a leader and a moulder of thought to a far greater extent than the average minister at home so that his position regarding the central

doctrines of evangelical faith becomes of unusual importance. You will agree with us that it would be harmful to the cause we all love if the charge were to be made that the Board is appointing men who deny a cardinal truth of the Gospel unless the Board is in a position to reply that it has especially referred that statement to the Presbytery involved, and that the Presbytery declared that the statement to be unfounded. The Board would then be able to state authoritatively that that particular fact has been inquired into with satisfactory results.

While, therefore, the Board does not wish to question the validity of the action that you have already taken, yet in view of the special responsibility that the Board sustains to the foreign missionaries under its care and to the Church as their sponsers, it deemed it wise, at its meeting the 7th instant, to take the following action:-

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Presbytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question.

The Board directed the Secretaries to express to Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field its great regret that it had been found necessary to raise any question as to sending them to the foreign field. It particularly wishes to express to Mr. Gleysteen its sympathy in the distress caused by the illness of his father, and assures him that the prayers of the Board will be offered in his behalf."

You will of course understand that this action of the Board is not intended to indicate any opinion as to the correctness of incorrectness of the statement referred to, but that it is simply a request for your judgment.

On behalf of the Board,

(signed) Arthur J. Brown,

Secretary.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

Nov. 9th., 1904.

To the Presbytery of Brooklyn,

The Rev. Frederick Campbell, D.D., Stated Clerk.,

Brooklyn, New York.

Dear Brethren:

The statement has been made to the Board that the Rev. Frank E. Field and the Rev. Wm. H. Gleysteen, members of your Presbytery who are under appointment to the foreign field, are radically defective in their views of certain fundamental evangelical doctrines particularly "the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards." The Board would fain believe that the statement rests upon a misapprehension, especially as it has received your communication of October 25th renewing the recommendation of the Presbytery that these brethren be sent to the foreign field. The statement, however, is definitely and positively made and you will appreciate the Board's disturbance of mind. It would be a serious matter from the viewpoint of justice to Mr. Field and Mr. Gleysteen as well as from the viewpoint of the interests of foreign missions if these brethren were to go to the foreign field with such a ~~charge~~ cloud hanging over them.

We hesitate to bring the matter to your attention as we remember that you have already examined these brethren for ordination, and yet we are sure that the Presbytery will appreciate the embarrassment of the situation and the desirability of clearing up ~~the~~ any misapprehension ~~if such it be. The~~ that may be found to exist. The foreign missionary in Asia is a leader and moulder of thought to a far greater extent than the average minister at home so that his position regarding the central doctrines of evangelical faith becomes of unusual importance. ~~We are confident that~~ You will

agree with us that it would be harmful to the cause we all love if the charge were to be made that the Board is appointing men who deny a cardinal truth of the Gospel unless the Board is in a position to reply that it has specially referred that statement to the Presbytery involved, and that the Presbytery declared the statement to be unfounded. The Board would then be able to state authoritatively that that particular fact has been enquired into with satisfactory results.

While therefore, the Board does not wish to question the validity of the action that you have already taken, yet in view of the special responsibility that the Board sustains to the foreign missionaries under its care and to the Church as their sponsers, it deemed it wise, at its meeting the 7th instant, to take the following action, ~~which I was instructed to communicate to you:-~~

single space

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Presbytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question.

The Board directed the Secretaries to express to Mr. Gleysteen and Mr. Field its great regret that it had been found necessary to raise any question as to sending them to the foreign field. It particularly wishes to express to Mr. Gleysteen its sympathy in the distress caused by the illness of his father, and assures him that the prayers of the Board will be offered in his behalf."

You will of course understand that this action of the Board is not intended to indicate any opinion as to the correctness or incorrectness of the statement referred to, but that it is ~~but~~ simply a request for your judgment.

On behalf of the Board,

Secretary.

New York City, Ovt. 5, 1904.

The undersigned, members of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, whose names were attached to the complaint of July 16th, last, addressed to the Synod of New York, having received from the appointed committee of Presbytery a copy of the resolution of Presbytery, requesting the withdrawal of the complaint, do hereby express their compliance with said request, by authorizing the complaint to be withdrawn.

In so doing, the undersigned desire it to be distinctly understood that the step which they now take is not due to any change of conviction as to the things complained of or the grounds on which complaint was made. But, it being manifest by expressions of members in Presbytery that the object of the complaint is already largely accomplished, we entertain hope that in the future a strict adherence to Presbyterian doctrine and law will obviate the necessity of repeating the step which we have taken solely as a matter of principle and with very deep pain; and we accept the assurances given us by Presbytery that irregularities such as are complained of will not be repeated. We further state that our withdrawal of the complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards.

Lewis Ray Foote,
Frederick Campbell,
Walter M. Aikman ,
Darwin E. James,
Eliphalet B. Terry.

Statement

New York City, Ovt. 5, 1904.

The undersigned, members of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, whose names were attached to the complaint of July 16th, last, addressed to the Synod of New York, having received from the appointed committee of Presbytery a copy of the resolution of Presbytery, requesting the withdrawal of the complaint, do hereby express their compliance with said request, by authorizing the complaint to be withdrawn.

In so doing, the undersigned desire it to be distinctly understood that the step which they now take is not due to any change of conviction as to the things complained of or the grounds on which complaint was made. But, it being manifest by expressions of members in Presbytery that the object of the complaint is already largely accomplished, we entertain hope that in the future a strict adherence to Presbyterian doctrine and law will obviate the necessity of repeating the step which we have taken solely as a matter of principle and with very deep pain; and we accept the assurances given us by Presbytery that irregularities such as are complained of will not be repeated. We further state that our withdrawal of the complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards.

Lewis Ray Foote,
Frederick Campbell,
Walter M. Aikman ,
Darwin E. James,
Eliphalet B. Terry.

New York City, Ovt. 5, 1904.

The undersigned, members of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, whose names were attached to the complaint of July 16th, last, addressed to the Synod of New York, having received from the appointed committee of Presbytery a copy of the resolution of Presbytery, requesting the withdrawal of the complaint, do hereby express their compliance with said request, by authorizing the complaint to be withdrawn.

In so doing, the undersigned desire it to be distinctly understood that the step which they now take is not due to any change of conviction as to the things complained of or the grounds on which complaint was made. But, it being manifest by expressions of members in Presbytery that the object of the complaint is already largely accomplished, we entertain hope that in the future a strict adherence to Presbyterian doctrine and law will obviate the necessity of repeating the step which we have taken solely as a matter of principle and with very deep pain; and we accept the assurances given us by Presbytery that irregularities such as are complained of will not be repeated. We further state that our withdrawal of the complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards.

Lewis Ray Foote,
Frederick Campbell,
Walter M. Aikman ,
Darwin R. James,
Eliphalet B. Terry.

New York City, Oct. 5, 1904.

Thw undersigned, members of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, whose names were attached to the complaint of July 16th, last, addressed to the Synod of New York, having received from the appointed Committee of Presbytery a copy of the resolution of Presbytery, requesting the withdrawal of the complaint, do hereby express their compliance with said request, by authorizing the complaint to be withdrawn.

In so doing, the undersigned desire it to be distinctly understood that the step which they now take is not due to any change of conviction as to the things complained of or the grounds on which complaint was made. But, it being manifest by expressions of members in Presbytery that the object of the complaint is already largely accomplished, we entertain hope that in the future a strict adherence to Presbyterian doctrine and law will obviate the necessity of repeating the step which we have taken solely as a matter of principle and with very deep pain; and we accept the assurances given us by Presbytery that irregularities such as are complained of will not be repeated. We further state that our withdrawal of the complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards.

Lewis Ray Foote,
Frederick Campbell,
Walter M. Aikman ,
Darwin E. James,
Eliphalet B. Terry.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2.

Same sent Mr. Field
Copy

Dec. 6th., 1904.

The Rev. Wm. H. Gleysteen,

Alton, Iowa.

My dear Mr. Gleysteen:

I enclose a copy of a letter of the Rev. Frederick Campbell, D.D., Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, dated Dec. 1st, and giving the action of the Presbytery at its meeting November 28th. I presented this communication at the meeting of our Board yesterday and the following action was taken:-

"On the basis of a communication, dated December 1st, from the Rev. Frederick S. Campbell, D.D., Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, the Rev. F. E. Field and the Rev. William Gleysteen were authorized to sail at once for their respective missions, and invview of their detention in this country for about three months beyond the time at which they had planned to sail, it wasvoted to appropriate to each the sum of $100. for home allowance."

I sent both you and Mr. Field the following telegram yesterday afternoon:-

"Board votes you one hundred dollars and authorizes sailing. Steamers leave San Francisco seventeenth and twenty-eighth . Telegraph preference and we will engage accommodations. "

We heartily congratulate you and Mr. Field on this issue, and we trust that you can now set your faces toward China with a deepened sense of God's guidance. We deeply regret the embarrassment which has developed, but we are sure that you appreciate the circumstances and that your own feeling is one of kindliness and respect for the conscientious convictions of all the brethren concerned. The part of the Board in the matter has been an exceedingly difficult and delicate one.

As soon as I receive your telegram as to the date of your departure from San Francisco, I shall have pleasure in writing to your

Mission announcing your coming and suggesting that letters be sent to you in care of the Presbyterian Mission Press, 18 Peking Road, Shanghai. Of course it is possible that no letters may arrive because you may get to Shanghai before there would be time for my letter to reach North China and the missionaries to get letters back to Shanghai. So if there are no letters there, go on at once to Peking. Dr. Fitch, the Manager of the Mission Press, will give you all needful directions. You will be very heartily welcomed on the field, and you need not anticipate the slightest embarrassment on account of your detention in this country, as I shall write such a letter to the Mission as I think will obviate anything of that sort.

May God give you a long and useful service in China for the Christ whom you love.

Wm. H. Glysteen and Frank E. Field

Date of first letter Feb. 8, 1904

Affiliated April 4, 1904

Glysteen United Dutch Reformed Church Alton Iowa 1892
and when affiliated Collegiate Reformed Church
Fifth Ave. & 48th Street, New York

Field was member of United Brethren in Christ
Church since 1883

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Copie

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

November 9th, 1904.

The Rev. John F. Carson, D. D.,
Pastor Central Presbyterian Church,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

My dear Dr. Carson:-

We heartily appreciate your kindness in so promptly answering my inquiry of the 5th inst. Both your letters were read to the Board. In accordance with your request, I return enclosed the copy of the original complaint of Dr. Campbell and others.

The letter to Dr. Campbell which you stated in your letter was enclosed, was not in the envelope. I should be very glad if you could send it to me now.

I enclose a copy of an official letter which by the order of the Board I have just sent to Dr. Campbell, the Stated Clerk.

You will appreciate our deep regret and our earnest desire that the Spirit of God may lead all concerned to an amicable and satisfactory conclusion.

Cordially yours,

Enc.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

November 9th, 1904.

The Rev. John F. Carson, D. D.,
Pastor Central Presbyterian Church,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

My dear Dr. Carson:-

We heartily appreciate your kindness in so promptly answering my inquiry of the 5th inst. Both your letters were read to the Board. In accordance with your request, I return enclosed the copy of the original complaint of Dr. Campbell and others.

The letter to Dr. Campbell which you stated in your letter was enclosed, was not in the envelope. I should be very glad if you could send it to me now.

I enclose a copy of an official letter which by the order of the Board I have just sent to Dr. Campbell, the Stated Clerk.

You will appreciate our deep regret and our earnest desire that the Spirit of God may lead all concerned to an amicable and satisfactory conclusion.

Cordially yours,

Enc.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

November 9th, 1924.

The Rev. John F. Carson, D. D.,
Pastor Central Presbyterian Church,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

My dear Dr. Carson:-

We heartily appreciate your kindness in so promptly answering my inquiry of the 5th inst. Both your letters were read to the Board. In accordance with your request, I return enclosed the copy of the original complaint of Dr. Campbell and others.

The letter to Dr. Campbell which you stated in your letter was enclosed, was not in the envelope. I should be very glad if you could send it to me now.

I enclose a copy of an official letter which by the order of the Board I have just sent to Dr. Campbell, the Stated Clerk.

You will appreciate our deep regret and our earnest desire that the Spirit of God may lead all concerned to an amicable and satisfactory conclusion.

Cordially yours,

Enc.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

November 9th, 1934.

The Rev. John F. Carson, D. D.,
Pastor Central Presbyterian Church,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

My dear Dr. Carson:-

We heartily appreciate your kindness in so promptly answering my inquiry of the 5th inst. Both your letters were read to the Board. In accordance with your request, I return enclosed the copy of the original complaint of Dr. Campbell and others.

The letter to Dr. Campbell which you stated in your letter was enclosed, was not in the envelope. I should be very glad if you could send it to me now.

I enclose a copy of an official letter which by the order of the Board I have just sent to Dr. Campbell, the Stated Clerk.

You will appreciate our deep regret and our earnest desire that the Spirit of God may lead all concerned to an amicable and satisfactory conclusion.

Cordially yours,

Enc.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

Copy.

November 9th, 1904.

The Rev. Allen Macy Dulles, D. D.,
Auburn, N. Y.

My dear Dr. Dulles:-

Early in October I received an unsigned letter from Watertown, dated October 1st, expressing surprise and disappointment regarding the questions which had arisen as to the appointment of the Rev. William H. Gleysteen, whom Mr. McConaughy had assigned to the Watertown church. I assumed that you wrote the letter, but delayed answering in the expectation that some action would be taken by the Synod which would clear the situation. When that action was taken, I was beyond the Mississippi river attending as a representative of the Board the meetings in that region and on my return I found that the pending questions had not yet been adjusted. Just what the outcome is to be so far as Mr. Gleysteen is concerned, I do not know as the Presbytery of Brooklyn is to give further consideration to the matter at its meeting November 28th, at which time ~~probably~~ I hope the whole matter will be cleared.

Meantime, however, it ought to be understood by our friends in Watertown that not the slightest blame can be attached to Mr. McConaughy. When Mr. McConaughy suggested Mr. Gleysteen to the Watertown church, the latter was a regularly appointed foreign missionary under appointment to the Peking Mission and no questions whatever so far as Mr. McConaughy knew had been raised. It was not until some time afterward that Mr. McConaughy learned of the complaint to Synod and at that time he was away from the city on a long tour among the churches of the Mississippi Valley. The questions that were raised regarding Mr. Gley-

steen were as much a surprise to Mr. McConaughy as to anyone else.

The Presbytery of Brooklyn sustained Mr. Gleysteen's examination and ordained him by a three-fourths majority, and October 25th the Presbytery emphatically reiterated its approval and its recommendations to the Board to send him to the field. Mr. Gleysteen is a man of exceptional ability and of fine Christian spirit and he is waiting with true Christian courtesy and patience until the adjustment of the questions which have been raised, ~~by a minority of the Presbytery.~~

Cordially yours,

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

(Copies

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

November 11th, 1904.

The Rev. Robert R. Booth, D. D., LL.D.,

Hotel St. Andrew, New York City.

My dear Dr. Booth:-

In accordance with your telephone request of this morning, I have pleasure in enclosing a copy of the Board's action of May 6th, 1902.

I was away at that time on my tour of Asia, but I find on referring to the record that the following members and officers of the Board were present:

Drs. Alexander, Booth, Gregg, Patterson, Richards; Messrs. Foster, Ide, James, Stevenson, Stiger, Underwood; Secretaries, Ellinwood, Speer, Halsey, Fenn and Mr. Hand (Treasurer).

Cordially yours,

Enc.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

November 11th, 1904.

The Rev. Robert R. Booth, D. D., LL.D.,

Hotel St. Andrew, New York City.

My dear Dr. Booth:-

In accordance with your telephone request of this morning, I have pleasure in enclosing a copy of the Board's action of May 6th, 1902.

I was away at that time on my tour of Asia, but I find on referring to the record that the following members and officers of the Board were present:

Drs. Alexander, Booth, Gregg, Patterson, Richards; Messrs. Foster, Ide, James, Stevenson, Stiger, Underwood; Secretaries, Ellinwood, Speer, Halsey, Fenn and Mr. Hand (Treasurer).

Cordially yours,

Enc.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

November 11th, 1914.

The Rev. Robert E. Booth, D. D., LL.D.,
Hotel St. Andrew, New York City.

My dear Dr. Booth:-

In accordance with your telephone request of this morning, I have pleasure in enclosing a copy of the Board's action of May 8th, 1912.

I was away at that time on my tour of Asia, but I find on referring to the record that the following members and officers of the Board were present:

Mrs. Alexander, Booth, Gregg, Patterson, Richards; Messrs. Foster, Ide, James, Stevenson, Stiger, Underwood; Secretaries, Ellinwood, Speer, Halsey, Fenn and Mr. Hand (Treasurer).

Cordially yours,

Enc.

(Copy)

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A.B.C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2

Nov. 5th., 1904.

The Rev. John F. Carson, D.D., (Same to Dr. McAfee)
Central Presbyterian Church,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

My dearDr. Carson:

We are informed that the Rev. Mr L. R. Foote, the Rev. Frederick Campbell, the Rev. Walter M. Aikman, Mr. Darwin R. James and Mr. E. B. Terry, in complying with the request of the Committee of Brooklyn Presbytery to withdraw their complaint to Synod regarding the ordination of the Revs. W. H. Gleysteen and F. E. Field, did so "only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards."

As we understand that you were (a member) Chairman of the Committee, I venture to ask whether this "understanding" was "accepted" by your Committee in any such sense as to warrant the inference that in the cases referred to, the Presbytery had ordained men "who deny the doctrine of the Atonement as contained in our standards"? Did your Committee make any disclaimer or statement in reply and if so, could I have a copy of it; or if it was not written, your own report of it?

As it is very important that your reply should reach me before Monday noon, it would be a great favor if you would reply in the enclosed envelope on which I have placed a special delivery stamp.

Enc.

Cordially yours,

Arthur J Brown

COPY.

5th November, 1904.

Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.,
New York City.

My dear Dr. Brown:

A wedding is set for next Monday afternoon at 4 o'clock. It comes plumpt in the middle of the meeting of the Board. I am going to make an effort to get out of it, having failed to get the hour changed. I am very anxious not to miss the next meeting of the Board.

I have been present at only two meetings of the Presbytery. The one at which the resolution which you quote was passed appeared as large as the other, tho I cannot say how many were present. It was certainly a "fairly representative meeting" of the Presbytery. Dr. Foote was not present. Mr. James was not present. But the resolution was introduced in a perfectly open way and discussion was invited. No one spoke and the resolution was adopted unanimously. I heard afterward nothing but words of pleasure that it had been done. Certainly it would be monstrous to pretend that the resolution was railroaded through, or put through in any clandestine way. It was introduced by Dr. John F. Carson, and I had nothing to do with it except that I saw it before it was introduced. Back of it were Dr. Hutchins, and my good Elder Pearson.

Personally I am a little restive under the tendency to go back of the Presbytery in matters of ecclesiastical standing. If I were entirely out of the Board and did not know the spirit of the brethren, I would be inclined to rise up and make a fight against any movement of the sort, and I know several men outside the Board who incline to feel rather sharp about this. I wanted very much at the last meeting to have counseled that the matter go back to the Presbytery if there was reason to think that it had not received their care. Once it is known that a Presbytery has given careful thought to a question of the sort, it seems highly improper for any of the Boards of the church to seek to pass on it over their heads or behind their backs.

Very cordially,
sighed- Cleland B. McAfee

COPY.

5th November, 1904.

Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.,

New York City.

My dear Dr. Brown:

A wedding is set for next Monday afternoon at 4 o'clock. It comes plumpt in the middle of the meeting of the Board. I am going to make an effort to get out of it, having failed to get the hour changed. I am very anxious not to miss the next meeting of the Board.

I have been present at only two meetings of the Presbytery. The one at which the resolution which you quote was passed appeared as large as the other, tho I cannot say how many were present. It was certainly a "fairly representative meeting" of the Presbytery. Dr. Foote was not present. Mr. James was not present. But the resolution was introduced in a perfectly open way and discussion was invited. No one spoke and the resolution was adopted unanimously. I heard afterward nothing but words of pleasure that it had been done. Certainly it would be monstrous to pretend that the resolution was railroaded through, or put through in any clandestine way. It was introduced by Dr. John F. Carson, and I had nothing to do with it except that I saw it before it was introduced. Back of it were Dr. Hutchins, and my good Elder Pearson.

Personally I am a little restive under the tendency to go back of the Presbytery in matters of ecclesiastical standing. If I were entirely out of the Board and did not know the spirit of the brethren, I would be inclined to rise up and make a fight against any movement of the sort, and I know several men outside the Board who incline to feel rather sharp about this. I wanted very much at the last meeting to have counseled that the matter go back to the Presbytery if there was reason to think that it had not received their care. Once it is known that a Presbytery has given careful thought to a question of the sort, it seems highly improper for any of the Boards of the church to seek to pass on it over their heads or behind their backs.

Very cordially,

sighed- Cleland B. McAfee.

COPY.

5th November, 1904.

Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.,

New York City.

My dear Dr. Brown:

A wedding is set for next Monday afternoon at 4 o'clock. It comes plumpt in the middle of the meeting of the Board. I am going to make an effort to get out of it, having failed to get the hour changed. I am very anxious not to miss the next meeting of the Board.

I have been present at only two meetings of the Presbytery. The one at which the resolution which you quote was passed appeared as large as the other, tho I cannot say how many were present. It was certainly a "fairly representative meeting" of the Presbytery. Dr. Foote was not present. Mr. James was not present. But the resolution was introduced in a perfectly open way and discussion was invited. No one spoke and the resolution was adopted unanimously. I heard afterward nothing but words of pleasure that it had been done. Certainly it would be monstrous to pretend that the resolution was railroaded through, or put through in any clandestine way. It was introduced by Dr. John F. Carson, and I had nothing to do with it except that I saw it before it was introduced. Back of it were Dr. Hutchins, and my good Elder Pearson.

Personally I am a little restive under the tendency to go back of the Presbytery in matters of ecclesiastical standing. If I were entirely out of the Board and did not know the spirit of the brethren, I would be inclined to rise up and make a fight against any movement of the sort, and I know several men outside the Board who incline to feel rather sharp about this. I wanted very much at the last meeting to have counseled that the matter go back to the Presbytery if there was reason to think that it had not received their care. Once it is known that a Presbytery has given careful thought to a question of the sort, it seems highly improper for any of the Boards of the church to seek to pass on it over their heads or behind their backs.

Very cordially,

signed- Cleland B. McAfee.

COPY.

5th November, 1904.

Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.,

New York City.

My dear Dr. Brown:

A wedding is set for next Monday afternoon at 4 o'clock. It comes plumpt in the middle of the meeting of the Board. I am going to make an effort to get out of it, having failed to get the hour changed. I am very anxious not to miss the next meeting of the Board.

I have been present at only two meetings of the Presbytery. The one at which the resolution which you quote was passed appeared as large as the other, tho I cannot say how many were present. It was certainly a "fairly representative meeting" of the Presbytery. Dr. Roots was not present. Dr. James was not present. But the resolution was introduced in a perfectly open way and discussion was invited. No one spoke and the resolution was adopted unanimously. I heard afterward nothing but words of pleasure that it had been done. Certainly it would be monstrous to pretend that the resolution was railroaded through, or put through in any clandestine way. It was introduced by Dr. John F. Carson, and I had nothin to do with it except that I saw it before it was introduced. Back of it were Dr. Hutchins, and my good Elder Pearson.

Personally I am a little restive under the tendency to go back of the Presbytery in matters of ecclesiastical standing. If I were entirely out of the Board and did not know the spirit of the brethren, I would be inclined to rise up and make a fight against any movement of the sort, and I know several men outside the Board who incline to feel rather sharp about this. I wanted very much at the last meeting to have counseled that the matter go back to the Presbytery if there was reason to think that it had not received their care. Once it is known that a Presbytery has given careful thought to a question of the sort, it seems highly improper for any of the Boards of the church to seek to pass on it over their heads or behind their backs.

Very cordially, (signed) Cleland B. McAfee.

COPY.

5th November, 1904.

Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.,

New York City.

My dear Dr. Brown:

A wedding is set for next Monday afternoon at 4 o'clock. It comes plumpt in the middle of the meeting of the Board. I am going to make an effort to get out of it, having failed to get the hour changed. I am very anxious not to miss the next meeting of the Board.

I have been present at only two meetings of the Presbytery. The one at which the resolution which you quote was passed appeared as large as the other, tho I cannot say how many were present. It was certainly a "fairly representative meeting" of the Presbytery. Dr. Foote was not present. Mr. James was not present. But the resolution was introduced in a perfectly open way and discussion was invited. no one spoke and the resolution was adopted unanimously. I heard afterward nothing but words of pleasure that it had been done. Certainly it would be monstrous to pretend that the resolution was railroaded through, or put through in any clandestine way. It was introduced by Dr. John F. Carson, and I had nothin to do with it except that I saw it before it was introduced. Back of it were Dr. Hutchins, and my good Elder Pearson.

Personally I am a little restive under the tendency to go back of the Presbytery in matters of ecclesiastical standing. If I were entirely out of the board and did not know the spirit of the brethren, I would be inclined to rise up and make a fight against any movement of the sort, and I know several men outside the Board who incline to feel rather sharp about this. I wanted very much at the last meeting to have counseled that the matter go back to the Presbytery if there was reason to think that it had not received their care. Once it is known that a Presbytery has given careful thought to a question of the sort, it seems highly improper for any of the Boards of the church to seek to pass on it over their heads or behind their backs.

Very cordially, signed - Cleland B. McAfee

COPY.

Dear Dr. Brown:

My letter of this morning made reference to the matter of your special delivery letter of this date. Replying to your specific question let me state that the clause which you quote was added by Dr. Foote in his reply to Dr. Carson, who sent it to me. I at once wrote Dr. Carson that the clause seemed to me of no value because we were not authorized nor prepared to admit that any violation of clause had ever occurred. Meanwhile, he wrote Dr. Foote that the clause had attracted his attention and that it must be plainly understood that the Committee and the Presbytery were not admitting any such offence in the case of the two men under discussion. I heard Dr. Carson read that letter, and it was most explicit. I hope he will send you a copy.

After its receipt there was, I understand, ample time for the consent to be withdrawn and the complaint prosecuted. Let me say as a member of the Committee, that I was not present at the examination of the men, but I could never have agreed to being a party to so weak a confession of guilt as such an admission would imply.

If you can make this scrawl out, let me congratulate you.

Fraternally

(signed) Cleland B. McAfee.

COPY.

Dear Dr. Brown:

My letter of this morning made reference to the matter of your special delivery letter of this date. Replying to your specific question let me state that the clause which you quote was added by Dr. Foote in his reply to Dr. Carson, who sent it to me. I at once wrote Dr. Carson that the clause seemed to me of no value because we were not authorized nor prepared to admit that any violation of clause had ever occurred. Meanwhile, he wrote Dr. Foote that the clause had attracted his attention and that it must be plainly understood that the Committee and the Presbytery were not admitting any such offence in the case of the two men under discussion. I heard Dr. Carson read that letter, and it was most explicit. I hope he will send you a copy.

After its receipt there was, I understand, ample time for the consent to be withdrawn and the complaint prosecuted. Let me say as a member of the Committee, that I was not present at the examination of the men, but I could never have agreed to being a party to so weak a confession of guilt as such an admission would imply.

If you can make this scrawl out, let me congratulate you.

Fraternally

(signed) Cleland B. McAfee,

COPY.

Dear Dr. Brown:

My letter of this morning made reference to the matter of your special delivery letter of this date. Replying to your specific question let me state that the clause which you quote was added by Dr. Foote in his reply to Dr. Carson, who sent it to me. I at once wrote Dr. Carson that the clause seemed to me of no value because we were not authorized nor prepared to admit that any violation of clause had ever occurred. Meanwhile, he wrote Dr. Foote that the clause had attracted his attention and that it must be plainly understood that the Committee and the Presbytery were not admitting any such offence in the case of the two men under discussion. I heard Dr. Carson read that letter, and it was most explicit. I hope he will send you a copy.

After its receipt there was, I understand, ample time for the consent to be withdrawn and the complaint prosecuted. Let me say as a member of the Committee, that I was not present at the examination of the men, but I could never have agreed to being a party to so weak a confession of guilt as such an admission would imply.

If you can make this scrawl out, let me congratulate you.

Fraternally

(signed) Cleland B. McAfee.

COPY.

Dear Dr. Brown:

My letter of this morning made reference to the matter of your special delivery letter of this date. Replying to your specific question let me state that the clause which you quote was added by Dr. Foote in his reply to Dr. Carson, who sent it to me. I at once wrote Dr. Carson that the clause seemed to me of no value because we were not authorized nor prepared to admit that any violation of clause had ever occurred. Meanwhile, he wrote Dr. Foote that the clause had attracted his attention and that it must be plainly understood that the Committee and the Presbytery were not admitting any such offence in the case of the two men under discussion. I heard Dr. Carson read that letter, and it was most explicit. I hope he will send you a copy.

After its receipt there was, I understand, ample time for the consent to be withdrawn and the complaint prosecuted. Let me say as a member of the Committee, that I was not present at the examination of the men, but I could never have agreed to being a party to so weak a confession of guilt as such an admission would imply.

If you can make this scrawl out, let me congratulate you.

Fraternally

(signed) Cleland B. McAfee.

Extract from letter of the Rev. Cleland B. McAfee, D.D.,

Oct. 19th, 1904.

My only regret about last Monday's meeting is that the matter of the young men was not referred back to the Presbytery. I cannot speak as a member of the Board but as a Presbyter I think I should have preferred to have the Presbytery enter the correspondence with the young men rather than the Board. I am afraid of any of the Boards taking hold of matters which involve the investigation of doctrine. The Presbytery is the field certainly in such matters.

The installation last night went through with very great success, and I feel that we have started on a good year of work.

COPY. November 7th, 1904.

My dear Dr. Brown:

The paper submitted to the Committee of Presbytery by the complainants against certain actions of the Presbytery in the matter of the ordination of the Rev. W. H. Gleysteen and F. E. Field, a copy of which I infer you have received, was not understood by either the complainants or the committee as a condition on which the complaint would be withdrawn, but as a statement of the complainant's position. This paper never came before the Presbytery. The only matter acted upon by the Presbytery was the brief report of the committee, a copy of which the clerk of Presbytery may have sent you. I have not a copy of that report or I would send it to you.

The clause in the statement of the complainants:- "Our withdrawal of the complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the atonement as contained in our standards,"- was prepared by Dr. Foote and given to me after the other complainants had presented a paper which did not contain any such reference. At my suggestion to Dr. Foote his paper was sent to the other complainants and they incorporated it in their paper. I enclose you the original paper submitted by the complainants and which, you will note, does not contain any reference to doctrine. That reference was Dr. Foote's statement.

In accepting that statement from Dr. Foote I said to him that we could not possibly accept it if it was understood to imply that the Presbytery had at any time ordained men who denied "the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our standards." Dr. Foote clearly under-

stood this and readily accepted it. Any other construction of this statement is a misconstruction. The other complainants must have so understood it, for in a letter to Dr. Campbell, with whom I had all the correspondence for all the complainants except Dr. Foote, I stated the understanding between Dr. Foote and myself in accepting his statement. I said in my letter to Dr. Campbell: "In accepting Dr. Foote's condition I distinctly told him that its acceptance did not imply that the Presbytery had ever ordained men who denied the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our standards. He so understands it. The same must hold with others who may sign his condition."

Let me repeat, and as emphatically as my words can express it that Dr. Foote's statement was accepted with the distinct understanding that it did not imply that the Presbytery of Brooklyn had ever ordained men who denied the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our terms.

Permit me to say that the resolution re-commending the two young men to the Board of Foreign Missions for appointment to the foreign field was passed by the Presbytery without a dissenting vote. It is right to say that Dr. Foote was not present at that meeting, but knowing him as I do I feel confident that he would not have opposed the resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

(signed) J. F. Carson.

COPY. November 7th, 1904.

My dear Dr. Brown:

The paper submitted to the Committee of Presbytery by the complainants against certain actions of the Presbytery in the matter of the ordination of the Rev. WM H. Gleysteen and F. E. Field, a copy of which I infer you have received, was not understood by either the complainants or the committee as a condition on which the complaint would be withdrawn, but as a statement of the complainant's position. This paper never came before the Presbytery. The only matter acted upon by the Presbytery was the brief report of the committee, a copy of which the clerk of Presbytery may have sent you. I have not a copy of that report or I would send it to you.

The clause in the statement of the complainants:- "Our withdrawal of the complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the atonement as contained in our standards,"- was prepared by Dr. Foote and given to me after the other complainants had presented a paper which did not contain any such reference. At my suggestion to Dr. Foote his paper was sent to the other complainants and they incorporated it in their paper. I enclose you the original paper submitted by the complainants and which, you will note, does not contain any reference to doctrine. That reference was Dr. Foote's statement.

In accepting that statement from Dr. Foote I said to him that we could not possibly accept it if it was understood to imply that the Presbytery had at any time ordained men who denied "the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our standards." Dr. Foote clearly under-

stood this and readily accepted it. Any other construction of this statement is a misconstruction. The other complainants must have so understood it, for in a letter to Dr. Campbell, with whom I had all the correspondence for all the complainants except Dr. Foote, I stated the understanding between Dr. Foote and myself in accepting his statement. I said in my letter to Dr. Campbell: "In accepting Dr. Foote's condition I distinctly told him that its acceptance did not imply that the Presbytery had ever ordained men who denied the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our standards. He so understands it. The same must hold with others who may sign his condition."

Let me repeat, and as emphatically as my words can express it that Dr. Foote's statement was accepted with the distinct understanding that it did not imply that the Presbytery of Brooklyn had ever ordained men who denied the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our terms.

Permit me to say that the resolution re-commending the two young men to the Board of Foreign Missions for appointment to the foreign field was passed by the Presbytery without a dissenting vote. It is right to say that Dr. Foote was not present at that meeting, but knowing him as I do I feel confident that he would not have opposed the resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

(signed)J. F. Carson.

COPY. November 7th, 1904.

My dear Dr. Brown:

The paper submitted to the Committee of Presbytery by the complainants against certain actions of the Presbytery in the matter of the ordination of the Rev. Wm H. Gleysteen and F. E. Field, a copy of which I infer you have received, was not understood by either the complainants or the committee as a condition on which the complaint would be withdrawn, but as a statement of the complainant's position. This paper never came before the Presbytery. The only matter acted upon by the Presbytery was the brief report of the committee, a copy of which the clerk of Presbytery may have sent you. I have not a copy of that report or I would send it to you.

The clause in the statement of the complainants:- "Our withdrawal of the complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the atonement as contained in our standards,"- was prepared by Dr. Foote and given to me after the other complainants had presented a paper which did not contain any such reference. At my suggestion to Dr. Foote his paper was sent to the other complainants and they incorporated it in their paper. I enclose you the original paper submitted by the complainants and which, you will note, does not contain any reference to doctrine. That reference was Dr. Foote's statement.

In accepting that statement from Dr. Foote I said to him that we could not possibly accept it if it was understood to imply that the Presbytery had at any time ordained men who denied "the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our standards." Dr. Foote clearly under-

stood this and readily accepted it. Any other construction of this statement is a misconstruction. The other complainants must have so understood it, for in a letter to Dr. Campbell, with whom I had all the correspondence for all the complainants except Dr. Foote, I stated the understanding between Dr. Foote and myself in accepting his statement. I said in my letter to Dr. Campbell: "In accepting Dr. Foote's condition I distinctly told him that its acceptance did not imply that the Presbytery had ever ordained men who denied the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our standards. He so understands it. The same must hold with others who may sign his condition."

Let me repeat, and as emphatically as my words can express it that Dr. Foote's statement was accepted with the distinct understanding that it did not imply that the Presbytery of Brooklyn had ever ordained men who denied the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our terms.

Permit me to say that the resolution re-commending the two young men to the Board of Foreign Missions for appointment to the foreign field was passed by the Presbytery without a dissenting vote. It is right to say that Dr. Foote was not present at that meeting, but knowing him as I do I feel confident that he would not have opposed the resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

(signed)J. F. Carson.

COPY.

November 7th, 1904.

My dear Dr. Brown:

The paper submitted to the Committee of Presbytery by the complainants against certain actions of the Presbytery in the matter of the ordination of the Rev. Wm H. Claysteen and F. E. Field, a copy of which I infer you have received, was not understood by either the complainants or the committee as a condition on which the complaint would be withdrawn, but as a statement of the complainant's position. This paper never came before the Presbytery. The only matter acted upon by the Presbytery was the brief report of the committee, a copy of which the clerk of Presbytery may have sent you. I have not a copy of that report or I would send it to you.

The clause in the statement of the complainants:- "Our withdrawal of the complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the atonement as contained in our standards."- was prepared by Dr. Foote and given to me after the other complainants had presented a paper which did not contain any such reference. At my suggestion to Dr. Foote his paper was sent to the other complainants and they incorporated it in their paper. I enclose you the original paper submitted by the complainants and which, you will note, does not contain any reference to doctrine. That reference was Dr. Foote's statement.

In accepting that statement from Dr. Foote I said to him that we could not possibly accept it if it was understood to imply that the Presbytery had at any time ordained men who denied "the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our standards." Dr. Foote clearly under-

stood this and readily accepted it. Any other construction of this statement is a misconstruction. The other complainants must have so understood it, for in a letter to Dr. Campbell, with whom I had all the correspondence for all the complainants except Dr. Foote, I stated the understanding between Dr. Foote and myself in accepting his statement. I said in my letter to Dr. Campbell: "In accepting Dr. Foote's condition I distinctly told him that its acceptance did not imply that the Presbytery had ever ordained men who denied the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our standards. He so understands it. The same must hold with others who may sign his condition."

Let me repeat, and as emphatically as my words can express it that Dr. Foote's statement was accepted with the distinct understanding that it did not imply that the Presbytery of Brooklyn had ever ordained men who denied the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our terms.

Permit me to say that the resolution re-commending the two young men to the Board of Foreign Missions for appointment to the foreign field was passed by the Presbytery without a dissenting vote. It is right to say that Dr. Foote was not present at that meeting, but knowing him as I do I feel confident that he would not have opposed the resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

(signed) J. F. Carson.

COPY. November 7th, 1904.

My dear Dr. Brown:

The paper submitted to the Committee of Presbytery by the complainants against certain actions of the Presbytery in the matter of the ordination of the Rev. Wm H. Gleysteen and F. B. Field, a copy of which I infer you have received, was not understood by either the complainants or the committee as a condition on which the complaint would be withdrawn, but as a statement of the complainant's position. This paper never came before the Presbytery. The only matter acted upon by the Presbytery was the brief report of the committee, a copy of which the clerk of Presbytery may have sent you. I have not a copy of that report or I would send it to you.

The clause in the statement of the complainants:- "Our withdrawal of the complaint is only with the express understanding, and so accepted by the committee to wait upon the complainants, that the action of the Presbytery is understood by the complainants as an assurance that men shall not be ordained who deny the doctrine of the atonement as contained in our standards,"- was prepared by Dr. Foote and given to me after the other complainants had presented a paper which did not contain any such reference. At my suggestion to Dr. Foote his paper was sent to the other complainants and they incorporated it in their paper. I enclose you the original paper submitted by the complainants and which, you will note, does not contain any reference to doctrine. That reference was Dr. Foote's statement.

In accepting that statement from Dr. Foote I said to him that we could not possibly accept it if it was understood to imply that the Presbytery had at any time ordained men who denied "the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our standards." Dr. Foote clearly under-

stood this and readily accepted it. Any other construction of this statement is a misconstruction. The other complainants must have so understood it, for in a letter to Dr. Campbell, with whom I had all the correspondence for all the complainants except Dr. Foote, I stated the understanding between Dr. Foote and myself in accepting his statement. I said in my letter to Dr. Campbell: "In accepting Dr. Foote's condition I distinctly told him that its acceptance did not imply that the Presbytery had ever ordained men who denied the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our standards. He so understands it. The same must hold with others who may sign his condition."

Let me repeat, and as emphatically as my words can express it that Dr. Foote's statement was accepted with the distinct understanding that it did not imply that the Presbytery of Brooklyn had ever ordained men who denied the doctrine of the Atonement as stated in our terms.

Permit me to say that the resolution re-commending the two young men to the Board of Foreign Missions for appointment to the foreign field was passed by the Presbytery without a dissenting vote. It is right to say that Dr. Foote was not present at that meeting, but knowing him as I do I feel confident that he would not have opposed the resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

(signed) J. F. Carson.

November 7, 1904.

My dear Dr. Brown:

I enclose herewith letter which you request. I send also the first paper submitted by all the complainants except Dr. Foote, which covers only technical points in the complaint.

I send you also a copy of the letter which I sent to Dr. Campbell, the salient point of which I quote in my letter to you. Kindly return to me the original complaint. You need not return the letter to Dr. Campbell as I have another copy.

Let me say that some of us in Brooklyn feel pretty keenly on this whole matter. I personally do not know the two young men and never have seen them. But they are vouched for by the overwhelming vote of our Presbytery, only three men being in any doubt as to their views. The vital issue in the complaint of the brethren was not doctrinal, except with Dr. Foote, but was on the matter of irregularity in action. To raise the doctrinal question now is to practically bring a new issue. The Presbytery vouches for the doctrinal standing of these men and in not one utterance on the floor of Presbytery or in conference with any of the complainants was there an admission on our part that the young men were theologically unsound. I cannot make this too emphatic.

I hope the Board will respect the Presbytery's finding and decision in this matter. It seems to me that the Presbytery is the judge of the theological standing of men whom it ordains.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) J. F. Carson.

November 7, 1904.

My dear Dr. Brown:

I enclose herewith letter which you request. I snad also the first paper submitted by all the complainants except Dr. Foote, which covers only technical points in the complaint.

I send you also a copy of the letter which I sent to Dr. Campbell, the salient point of which I quote in my letter to you. Kindly return to me the original complaint. You need not return the letter to Dr. Campbell as I have another copy.

Let me say that some of us in Brooklyn feel pretty keenly on this whole matter. I personally do not know the two young men and never have seen them. But they are vouched for by the overwhelming vote of our Presbytery, only three men being in any doubt as to their views. The vital issue in the complaint of the brethren was not doctrinal, except with Dr. Foote, but was on the matter of irregularity in action. To raise the doctrinal question now is to practically bring a new issue. The Presbytery vouches for the doctrinal standing of these men and in not one utterance on the floor of Presbytery or in conference with any of the complainants was there an admission on our part that the young men were theologically unsound. I cannot make this too emphatic.

I hope the Board will respect the Presbytery's finding and decision in this matter. It seems to me that the Presbytery is the judge of the theological standing of men whom it ordains.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) J. F. Carson.

November 7, 1904.

My dear Dr. Brown:

I enclose herewith letter which you request. I send also the first paper submitted by all the complainants except Dr. Foote, which covers only technical points in the complaint.

I send you also a copy of the letter which I sent to Dr. Campbell, the salient point of which I quote in my letter to you. Kindly return to me the original complaint. You need not return the letter to Dr. Campbell as I have another copy.

Let me say that some of us in Brooklyn feel pretty keenly on this whole matter. I personally do not know the two young men and never have seen them. But they are vouched for by the overwhelming vote of our Presbytery, only three men being in any doubt as to their views. The vital issue in the complaint of the brethren was not doctrinal, except with Dr. Foote, but was on the matter of irregularity in action. To raise the doctrinal question now is to practically bring a new issue. The Presbytery vouches for the doctrinal standing of these men and in not one utterance on the floor of Presbytery or in conference with any of the complainants was there an admission on our part that the young men were theologically unsound. I cannot make this too emphatic.

I hope the Board will respect the Presbytery's finding and decision in this matter. It seems to me that the Presbytery is the judge of the theological standing of men whom it ordains.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) J. F. Carson.

November 7, 1904.

My dear Dr. Brown:

I enclose herewith letter which you request. I snad also the first paper submitted by all the complainants except Dr. Foote, which covers only technical points in the complaint.

I send you also a copy of the letter which I sent to Dr. Campbell, the salient point of which I quote in my letter to you. Kindly return to me the original complaint. You need not return the letter to Dr. Campbell as I have another copy.

Let me say that some of us in Brooklyn feel pretty keenly on this whole matter. I personally do not know the two young men and never have seen them. But they are vouched for by the overwhelming vote of our Presbytery, only three men being in any doubt as to their views. The vital issue in the complaint of the brethren was not doctrinal, except with Dr. Foote, but was on the matter of irregularity in action. To raise the doctrinal question now is to practically bring a new issue. The Presbytery vouches for the doctrinal standing of these men and in not one utterance on the floor of Presbytery or in conference with any of the complainants was there an admission on our part that the young men were theologically unsound. I cannot make this too emphatic.

I hope the Board will respect the Presbytery's finding and decision in this matter. It seems to me that the Presbytery is the judge of the theological standing of men whom it ordains.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) J. F. Carson.

November 7, 1904.

My dear Dr. Brown:

I enclose herewith letter which you request. I send also the first paper submitted by all the complainants except Dr. Foote, which covers only technical points in the complaint.

I send you also a copy of the letter which I sent to Dr. Campbell, the salient point of which I quote in my letter to you. Kindly return to me the original complaint. You need not return the letter to Dr. Campbell as I have another copy.

Let me say that some of us in Brooklyn feel pretty keenly on this whole matter. I personally do not know the two young men and never have seen them. But they are vouched for by the overwhelming vote of our Presbytery, only three men being in any doubt as to their views. The vital issue in the complaint of the brethren was not doctrinal, except with Dr. Foote, but was on the matter of irregularity in action. To raise the doctrinal question now is to practically bring a new issue. The Presbytery vouches for the doctrinal standing of these men and in not one utterance on the floor of Presbytery or in conference with any of the complainants was there an admission on our part that the young men were theologically unsound. I cannot make this too emphatic.

I hope the Board will respect the Presbytery's finding and decision in this matter. It seems to me that the Presbytery is the judge of the theological standing of men whom it ordains.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) J. F. Carson.

Rev. Frederick Campbell

RECEIVED
DEC 8 - 1904
Dr. Brown.

6

F. Campbell.

428 1/2 Clinton St., Brooklyn, N.Y., Dec. 1, 1904.

The Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D., Sec'y Board of Foreign Mis'ns:

Dear Brother:

Replying to the letter of the Board of Foreign Missions, of Nov. 9th ult., addressed by you as Secretary to the Presbytery of Brooklyn through me as Stated Clerk of the body, I respectfully report that, at its stated meeting held on Monday, Nov. 28th, the Presbytery adopted the following resolution:

"Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men "sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition "that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Pres-"byteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to "the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of "the Rev. Mr. Field and the Rev. Mr. Gleysteen special attention was "paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacri-"fice of Christ, and that they so approved themselves to the Presbytery as "brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

Yours truly,

Frederick Campbell

Stated Clerk, Presbytery of Brooklyn.